Quarterly

Vol. XVII. Part IV

# THE JOURNAL OF ORIENTAL RESEARCH MADRAS

(Founded by Mm. Prof. S. Kuppuswami Sastri, M.A.)

June 1948

तमसो मा ज्योतिर्गमय

THE KUPPUSWAMI SASTRI RESEARCH INSTITUTE, MYLAPORE
MADRAS

1950

Annual Subs., Inland, Rs. 8. Foreign, 14 Shillings.
Each part separately Rupees Two, Postage inclusive

## CONTENTS

VOL. XVII] [PART IV

PAGES

Vedic Studies: IV. Suṣma:
A. Venkatasubbiah .. 189—204

A Note on the Tumain Inscription:
B. Ch. Chhabra ... 205—208

God Puruṣottama at Puri and Cuttack:
Dines Chandra Sircar ... 209—215

Ganga Arkeśvara of Orissa:
Dines Chandra Sircar ... 216—217

The Artistry of Kālidāsa:
R. Rangachari ... 218—227

The Date of the Yogavāsiṣṭha:
V. Raghavan ... 228—231

A Note on Nāsatyau and Dasrau:
K. Balasubrahmanya Iyer ... 232

Monkeys and Serpents in the Epics:
T. R. Venkatarama Sastri ... 233—237

The Kuppuswami Sastri Research Institute: ... 238

Book Reviews ... 239—244

Supplements :

Tolkāppiyam-Poruḷ-Kaḷaviyal:
P. S. Subrahmanya Sastri ... 63—70

Avantisundarīkathāsāra:
G. Harihara Sastri ... 49—56

Kuppuswami Sastri Memorial Volume ... 97—120

# VEDIC STUDIES: IV. *ŚUṢMA*

BY

DR. A. VENKATASUBBIAH

(*Continued from Vol. XVI, p.* 177)

This word, by itself or compounded with other words, occurs in more than seventy verses of the RV. It occurs in the other Saṃhitās and Brāhmaṇas also though less frequently, and continues to be used in later Sanskrit literature.

The author of the Vedic Nighaṇṭu has included it among the twenty-eight synonyms of *bala* (bala-nāmāni, 2, 9) and Yāska, in the *Nirukta* (2, 24, 1), has derived it from the root *śuṣ* 'to dry' (*śuṣa śoṣaṇe*). This explanation and derivation are, as a rule, reproduced by the Vedic commentators Sāyaṇa, Uvaṭa, Mahīdhara, Skandasvāmin, Bhaṭṭa-Bhāskara and others; but Sāyaṇa, in addition, occasionally explains the word in his RV. commentary as *jvālāḥ* (4, 10, 4; 10, 142, 6), *tejaḥ* (2, 17, 1; 3, 32, 3), *senā-lakṣaṇaṃ balam* (6, 19, 8), *śatrūṇāṃ śoṣayitāraḥ* (1, 52, 4), *balavantaṃ putram* (7, 24, 4) and *vega* (9, 5, 1; 53, 1; 10, 75, 3). Devarāja, in his commentary on the Nighaṇṭu, refers to a statement[1] of the commentator Mādhava that *śuṣ* signifies 'to please' (*śuṣiḥ prīṇanārthaḥ*) and derives *śuṣma* from that *śuṣ*, explaining that *bala* is called *śuṣma* because it is dear (*priyaṃ hi balam*).

According to the later lexicographers (Amarasiṃha, Medinīkara, Halāyudha and Puruṣottama), *śuṣma* signifies not only *bala*, but also *ojas*, *tejas*, *arcis*, sun, fire and wind. (see PW. s.v.).

Böhtlingk and Roth, in the PW., derive *śuṣma* from *śvas*-*śuṣ* 'to breathe', and explain it as—'*adjective* (1) hissing, spraying, (2) fragrant; (3) courageous; *noun* (1) hiss, whistle, spray (of fire, water and wind), breath; (2) breath, fragrance (of a plant or fermenting drink), foam; (3)

1. This statement, it should be noted, is made by Mādhava in the explanation of the word *śūṣa* in 1, 9, 10; see p. 54 of the Adyar Library edition of Mādhava's commentary on the RV. As regards *śuṣma*, this commentator Mādhava, and Veṅkaṭārya's son Mādhava, both follow Yāska in deriving it from *śuṣ* 'to dry'; see their explanations of 1, 51, 15 (pp. 399, 400) and 1, 52, 4, (p. 402) in *op. cit.*

courage, impulse, impetuosity; (4) sexual impulse, spirit, living force, manly vigour or semen. This derivation is endorsed by Grassmann who, in his *Wört.*, explains *śuṣma* as '(1) strong, impetuous; (2) the hissing flame moving forward impetuously and noisily; (3) impetuosity, vigorous advance, vigour, courage; (4) powerful effect; (5) ardent desire (for food or sexual intercourse)'. On the other hand, Geldner, in his *RV. Gloss.*, derives *śuṣma* from *śuṣ* 'to impel, to urge, to put forth effort' and explains the word as 'die stürmische, explosive oder impulsive Kraft: (*a*) Wucht, Schuss, Ansturm, stürmische Gewalt; (*b*) Ungestüm, Eifer, Feuer, Wut, Kampfesmut, kriegerische Kraft; Kraft überhaupt, innere Kraft,. Drang, Impuls', translating it accordingly in his *R V. Über.* Bloomfield, in an article published in ZDMG. 48, p. 565 ff., while admitting that *śuṣma* signifies *bala* in many Vedic passages, endeavours to show that, in many verses of the RV. and AV, the context requires that *śuṣma* should be interpreted as 'lightning, gleam'; he believes (p. 574 l. c.) that this is the primary meaning of the word and that *bala* is a secondary meaning; and as for the derivation, he says that there is nothing to choose between the derivation from *śuṣ* 'to dry' and *śuś* 'to breathe' and that one is as possible as the other.[1]

Concerning the above-mentioned derivations, it is necessary to make the following remarks. (1) The words (*ā*) *śuṣe*, (*ā*) *śuṣāṇa* and *śuṣat* that occur in the verses referred to by Geldner in his *RV. Gloss*, s. v. *śuṣ* II signify respectively 'I call loudly', 'calling loudly', and 'making a loud sound', as we have seen in the preceding article, and not 'I urge', 'impelling' and 'exerting one's self' as believed by Geldner. They are all formed from *śuṣ*, which is another form, with *samprasāraṇa*, of the root *śvas* 'to breathe'; and in fact, there is no root *śuṣ* that signifies 'to urge, to impel, to make an effort'. (2) There is no connection between the ideas of 'drying' and 'strength'; on the other hand, there is the closest connection between the ideas of 'breathing (blowing)' 'strength' and 'fieriness (or effulgence)'. Compare the expressions 'a strong exhortation', 'a

---

1. It is, in fact, Bloomfield's opinion, that there is no need to inquire into the derivation of the word *śuṣma* and that it is enough to know that the meanings 'lightning, fire' with the derived meanings 'vigour, force' yield a good sense in all passages in which the word occurs.

spirited exhortation' and 'a fiery exhortation' which are more or less synonymous; compare also the words *anala* 'fire, wind, soul', *anila* 'wind', and *prāṇa* 'life, breath, strength, force, vigour' that are all derived from *an* 'to breathe'; see also Bloomfield's observations on p. 574 l. c. and Max Müller's observations in SBE. 32, Introd. p. xiii.

There can thus be no doubt that *śuṣma* is derived from the root *śvas-śuṣ* 'to breathe' (and not from *śuṣ* 'to dry'): *śuṣma* thus signifies (1) 'breath, breather, *śvasana*; (2) strong, strength, *bala*; (3) effulgent, effulgence, *tejas*'. The meanings 'flame, sun, fire' are but particularisations of the meaning *tejas*; so is the meaning 'semen' also (cp. Amarakośa 2, 601: *śukraṃ tejo-retasī ca bīja-vīryendriyāṇi ca* which mentions *śukra* and *tejas* as synonyms of *retas*), while the meaning 'wind' is a particularisation of that of 'breath' (or of 'blower'), and the meaning *senā* 'army, troop', a development of that of *bala*. In addition, since the root *śvas-śuṣ* signifies, (as we have seen above), 'to make a loud cry, to roar' also, *śuṣma* has, like the cognate word *śūṣa*, the signification of 'loud cry, shout, roar'.

It is of interest to note that Grassmann, in his *RV. Über.*, has felt himself obliged to translate *śuṣma* by 'roar, loud cry' in five passages, although he has not, in his *Wörterbuch*, admitted this meaning for *śuṣma*, and although he has not, either in the *Wört*, or in his *RV. Über.*, admitted the meaning of 'to make a loud sound, to roar' for the root *śvas-śus*. The first of such passages is 4, 10, 4: *ābhiṣ ṭe adya gīrbhir gṛṇanto 'gne dāśema pra te divo na stanayanti śuṣmāḥ*. Oldenberg, in SBE. 46, 350, translates this as "May we today worship thee, O Agni, praising thee with these songs. Thy roarings thunder like (the thunder) of heaven", closely following Grassmann in the explanation of the word *śuṣma* and of the verse as a whole. For my part, however, I believe that *śuṣmāḥ* does not signify 'roar' but *tejāṃsi* in this verse; it is to be construed, not only with *te* when it means 'flames', but with *divaḥ* also when it signifies 'lightnings'; and the meaning of the verse is: "May we make offerings to thee today, O Agni, praising thee with these songs. Thy lights (i.e., flames) thunder like the lights (*i.e.*, lightnings) of heaven". Regarding the loud sound made by Agni's flames, compare 1, 44, 12: *sindhor iva prasvanitāsa ūrmayo 'gner bhrājante arcayaḥ*

'Agni's flames shine, roaring like the waves of the sea'. Compare also 7, 3, 6 and 7,7,2 explained below.

The other four passages in which Grassmann interprets *śuṣma* as 'roar' and in which I agree in this interpretation are the following:

(1) 6, 36, 3: taṃ sadhrīcīr ūtayo vṛṣṇyāni
pauṃsyāni niyutaḥ saścur indram |
samudraṃ na sindhava ukthaśuṣmā
uruvyacasaṃ gira ā viśanti ||

"Him, Indra, followed the helpers (Maruts,) who are together (and) the valiant forces in teams. As the loud-sounding rivers enter into the wide ocean, in the same way there enter into (Indra) who has a wide capacity loud-sounding hymns of praise".

This verse is addressed to Indra and says that he was followed by the Maruts and other troops at the time when he fought with Vṛtra (cp. the immediately preceding verse *anu pra yeje jana ojo asya satrā dadhire anu vīryāya | syūmagṛbhe dudhaye 'rvate ca kratuṃ vṛñjanty api vṛtrahatye*) and that these troops addressed hymns of praise to him.

In pāda a, I follow Sāyaṇa in regarding *ūtayaḥ* as referring to the Maruts. Compare 1,52,4: *taṃ vṛtrahatye anu tasthur ūtayaḥ śuṣmā indram avātā ahrutapsavaḥ* which is explained below; compare also 5,60,3: *maruta......āpa iva sadhryañco dhavadhve.* 'You run together like the Waters, O Maruts' in which the epithet *sadhryac* is applied to the Maruts. This epithet is synonymous with *niyutaḥ* 'moving in teams' which is parallelly used in this verse, and is appropriate to the Maruts who are described in the RV as moving about in troops (*vrāta, gaṇa, śardha*); compare Macdonell's Ved. Myth., p. 77 and the verses referred to there.

The other 'forces' mentioned in pāda b are, without doubt, the Viśvedevas who too are said in 10, 113, 1-2 (*tam asya dyavāpṛthivī sacetasā viśvebhir devair anu śuṣmam āvatām| yad ait kṛṇvāno mahimānam indriyam.........devebhir indro maghavā sayāvabhir vṛtraṃ jaghanvāñ abhavad vareṇyaḥ*) and

other verses to have followed Indra when he set out to fight Vṛtra. They are mentioned separately in our verse because, unlike the Maruts, they did not stand firm, but fled abandoning Indra at the time of the fight. Compare 8, 96, 7: *vṛtrasya tvā śvasathād īṣamāṇā viśve devā ajahur ye sakhāyaḥ* explained (on p. XV. 62) above and the passage from Āit. Br. 3. 20, likewise explained there.

The hymns of praise, *giraḥ*, mentioned in pāda d, are those addressed by the Maruts and Viśvedevas to Indra on the occasion referred to above. Compare 10, 113, 8: *viśve devāso adha vṛṣṇyāni te'vardhayant somavatyā vacasyayā* "The All-gods then augmented thy might by praises accompanied by Soma".

In the second half-verse, the epithet *uktha-śuṣmāḥ*, 'loud-sounding', is to be construed with both *sindhavaḥ* and *giraḥ*. Regarding the loud sound made by rivers (or waves of rivers), compare 8, 44, 25; *agne dhṛta-vratāya te samudrāyeva sindhavaḥ | giro vāśrāsa īrate* "O Agni, to thee that upholdest the ordinances, there run loud-sounding hymns, as loud-sounding rivers run to the ocean that does not transgress the law (i.e., its bounds[1]"); 9, 50, 1; *ut te śuṣmāsa īrate sindhor ūrmer iva svanaḥ* which is explained below and 1, 44, 12; *sindhor iva prasvanitāsa ūrmayo 'gner bhrājante arcayaḥ* which has already been cited above. Regarding the loud sound made by hymns of praise, compare 3, 51, 1; *indraṃ giro bṛhatīr abhy anūṣata.* "The loud-sounding hymns called Indra"; 6, 45, 25: *imā u tvā śatakrato 'bhi pra ṇonuvur giraḥ | indra vatsaṃ na mātaraḥ* "These hymns, O Indra to whom many hymns are addressed

---

1. The word *dhṛtavratāya* is used here with a twofold meaning (1) 'upholding the ordinances; *i.e.*, keeping watch over the Law and seeing that it is not transgressed' in connection with Agni, and (2) 'keeping within bounds' in connection with the ocean. The latter refers to the ocean always keeping within bounds (*velā*; *maryādā*) and not overflowing it, an idea that is common-place in classical Sanskrit literature. Compare for instance, *prāṇātyaye'pi na tu sādhu-janaḥ suvṛttam velāṃ samudra iva laṅghayituṃ samarthaḥ*; Rāmāyaṇa, 6, 112, 16: *imām api viśālākṣīṃ rakṣitāṃ svena tejasā | Rāvaṇo nātivarteta velām iva mahodadhiḥ.*

have called loudly to thee, as mother-cows to their calf"; 1, 7, 1: *indraṃ vāṇīr anūṣatā* "the hymns have loudly called to Indra"; 1, 11, 8: *indram īśānam ojasā 'bhi stomā anūṣata* "the hymns have called loudly towards Indra who is ruler by his might" and 8, 44, 25 cited above. See also the other passages referred to by Grassman s.v. *nu* and *vāś*, and likewise 2, 2, 2: *abhi tvā naktīr uṣaso vavāśire 'gne vatsaṃ na svasareṣu dhenavaḥ.* "Towards thee, O Agni, did the *dhenus* (hymns, and also milch-cows[1]) cry loudly in the nights and in the mornings, as they do towards their calf at *sandhyā* times".

Similarly, the epithet *uruvyacasam* in pāda d has to be construed with both *indram* and *samudram*. Compare, on the one hand, 3, 50, 1: *oruvyacāḥ pṛṇatām ebhir annaiḥ* ('May he [Indra] of wide capacity fill himself with these foods'); 1, 104, 9: *uruvyacā jaṭhara ā vṛṣasva* ('Strengthen thyself in the stomach, O thou [Indra] that hast a wide capacity'); 7, 31, 11: *uruvyacase mahine suvṛktim indrāya brahma janayanta viprāḥ* ('for Indra, great and of wide capacity, the priests have made a well-cut hymn') in which the epithet *uruvyacas* is used of Indra, and on the other hand, verses like 9, 80, 1: *samudrāso na savanāni vivyacuḥ*; 8, 3, 4: *ayaṃ sahasram ṛṣibhiḥ sahaskṛtaḥ samudra iva paprathe*; 10, 62,9: *sāvarṇyasya dakṣiṇā vi sindhur iva paprathe*; 1, 30, 3: *samudro na vyaco dadhe* in which the wide expanse of the sea is referred to.

Compare also 3, 46, 4: *uruṃ gabhīraṃ januṣābhy ugraṃ viśvavyacasam avataṃ matīnām | indraṃ somāsaḥ pradivi sutāsaḥ samudraṃ na sravata ā viśanti* "Day after day, the pressed Soma juices enter into that pit of prayers, Indra, broad, deep, mighty from (the very moment of) birth, all-

1. The word *dhenu* is used here with a twofold meaning (1) 'hymn of praise' (see Nighaṇṭu 1, 11) in connection with Agni, and (2) 'milch-cow' in connection with the calf.

The translation given by me in VVSt. 1. 92 should be amended accordingly.

spreading, in the same way as rivers enter into the ocean, broad, deep, mighty from (the very moment of) birth, all-spreading", and note that, like the adjectives *urum*, *gabhīram*, *januṣā bhy ugram*, the adjective *viśvavyacasam* too (which is almost synonymous with *uruvyacasam* in our verse) qualifies both *indram* and *samudram*.

The double comparison between (1) hymns and rivers, and (2) the deity praised and the sea is contained in 1, 190, 7: *saṃ yaṃ stubho 'vanayo na yanti samudraṃ na sravato rodhacakrāḥ* addressed to Bṛhaspati, and 8, 6, 35: *indram ukthāni vāvṛdhuḥ samudram iva sindhavaḥ* also.

(2) 7, 3, 8: susaṃdṛk te svanīka pratīkaṃ  
vi yad rukmo na rocasa upāke |  
divo na te tanyatur eti śuṣmaś  
citro na suraḥ prati cakṣi bhānum ||

" O effulgent (Agni), lovely to see is thy form when thou shinest near, like a jewel. Thy roar goes up like the thunder of heaven; beautiful like the sun, thou sendest forth light".

(3) 10, 63, 3: yebhyo mātā mādhumat pinvate payaḥ  
pīyūṣaṃ dyāur aditir adribarhāḥ |  
uktha-śuṣmān vṛṣa-bharānt svapnasas  
tāñ ādityañ anu madā svastaye ||

This verse is addressed to the Ādityas, that is, to the sons of Aditi. But, although the word *aditi* actually occurs in pāda b, it is difficult to construe it with the word *mātā* in a. I therefore follow Sāyaṇa, Grassmann, Ludwig and Bergaigne (3, 90) in regarding it as an attribute of *dyauḥ*; and I translate the verse as:

" Praise, for the purpose of well-being, the Ādityas for whom (their) mother flows honeyed milk, and boundless Dyaus, strong with the bolt, milk; for whom praises are sung loudly, who are bringers of males (*i.e.*, of male children), and have much wealth".

The word *aditi* is used as an attribute of *dyaus* in 5, 59, 8 (see Bergaigne, l.c. and Macdonell's Ved. Myth., p. 121); and it seems to denote Dyaus in 10, 63, 2, the verse that precedes

ours. The Ādityas are the sons of Dyaus according to 6, 51, 4: *yūnaḥ sukṣatrān kṣayato divo nṝn ādityān yāmy aditim duvoyu* which mentions the Ādityas, Aditi (?) and Dyaus. The word *adri-barhāḥ* is interpreted as 'strong as a rock' by Sāyaṇa and Grassmann. Such an expression however does not occur in the RV; and I therefore interpret the word as 'strong with the bolt', *i.e.*, 'armed with the thunderbolt, having the thunder-bolt for arm'. Compare 4, 17, 13: *vibhañjanur aśanimāñ iva dyauḥ* and the passages given by Grassman s.v. *adri* in which that word signifies 'thunder-bolt'. *uktha-śuṣmān*= 'whose praises, *i.e.*, the praises addressed to whom, are loud'. Compare 6, 36, 3; 8, 44, 25, etc., cited above and other similar verses which describe prayers as 'crying loudly' towards Indra or other deities.

(4) 10, 75, 3: divi svano yatate bhumyopary-
anantaṃ śuṣmam ud iyarṣi bhānunā |
abhrād iva pra stanayanti vṛṣṭayaḥ
sindhur yad eti vṛṣabho na roruvat ||

" (Its) sound goes over the earth unto heaven; it sends forth a ceaseless roar with light. Rains thunder forth, as it were, from the sky when the river Sindhu goes forward, roaring like a bull".

This verse is in praise of the river Sindhu, and every one of the four pādas refers to the loud sound made by that river when flowing. This sound is compared, in pāda d, to the roaring of a bull, and to the sound of thunder and falling rain in c. Regarding the 'light' spoken of in b, compare the epithets *śucayaḥ* and *pāvakāḥ* that are applied to the waters in 7, 49, 2: *samudrārthā yāḥ śucayaḥ pāvakās tā āpo devīr iha mām avantu* " May the bright and shining waters that have the sea for their goal, the goddesses, protect me now".

Similarly, *śuṣma* signifies 'loud cry, roar' in the following passages also:

(5) 9, 50, 1: ut te śuṣmāsa īrate
sindhor ūrmér iva svanaḥ |
vāṇasya codayā pavim ||

" Thy roars go up (loud) like the sound of the sea-wave; emit the sound of the *vāṇa*".

This verse is addressed to Pavamāna Soma, the sound made by whom is often compared by RV poets to the neighing of a horse, to the roaring of a bull, to the lowing of calves, to the roar of the Maruts and Bṛhaspati, and to the sound of rain and thunder. Compare for instance 9, 43, 5: *indur atyo na vājasṛt kanikranti pavitra ā* (Soma), swift like a horse running for the prize, cries loudly in the filter"; 9, 71, 9: *ukṣeva yūthā pariyann arāvīt* "He roared like a bull approaching a herd (of cows)"; 9, 70, 7: *ruvati bhīmo vṛṣabhas taviṣyayā* "The fierce bull roars with impetuousness"; 9, 70, 6: *sa mātarā na dadṛśāna usriyo nānadad eti marutām iva svanaḥ* "Making a loud cry like a calf that sees its two parents, he (Soma) whose sound is like that of the Maruts, goes forward"; 9, 30, 2: *indur hiyānaḥ sotṛbhir mṛjyamānaḥ kanikradat| iyarti vagnum indriyam.* "Soma, urged by the priests that press, being purified, cries loudly and sends forth a roar like that of Indra"; 9, 80, 1: *bṛhaspate ravathenā vi didyute samudrāso na savanāni vivyacuḥ* "He fulgurated with the roar of Bṛhaspati; the pressed juices spread themselves like seas"; 9, 71, 2: *pra kṛṣṭiheva śūṣa eti roruvat* "He, the roarer, goes forward making a loud sound like a killer of men (*i.e.*, like a soldier in battle)"; 9, 86, 9: *divo na sānu stanayann acikradat* "He made a loud cry like the thundering ridge of heaven"; 9,87,8: *divo na vidyut stanayanty abhraiḥ somasya te pavata indra dhārā* "O, Indra, the torrent of Soma, thundering like the lightning of heaven with clouds, is being filtered for thee".

The meaning of pāda c is not certain. Sāyaṇa explains it as:

> *vāṇasya visṛṣṭasya vāṇasya nāḷasya vā*
> *vāditra-viśeṣasya paviṃ śabdam |*
> *pavih bhāratīti vāṅ-nāmasu pāṭhāt |*
> *codaya preraya |*
> *vegena syandamānas tvaṃ visṛṣṭa-vāṇa-śabda-sadṛśaṃ śabdaṃ kurv ity arthaḥ.*

Grassmann as, 'sharpen the tip of the arrow', and Ludwig as 'accelerate the beating of the Soma-shoot [of the sharpness of the reed]'. There does not seem to be any

doubt however that it refers to the making of some kind of loud sound, and that the interpretations of Grassmann and Ludwig are wide of the mark. One of the meanings assigned to *vāṇa* by Böhtlingk and Roth in the PW is 'a harp with a hundred strings'; and this meaning fits the context well here.

(6) 9, 53, 1 : ut te śuṣmaso asthū
rakṣo bhindanto adrivaḥ |
nudasva yāḥ parispṛdhaḥ ||

" Thy roars have gone up shattering demons, O thou with the (pressing-) stones. Drive off those that are (our) rivals". Compare, 9, 13, 8: *juṣṭa indrāya matsaraḥ pavamāna kanikradat* | *viśvā apa dviṣo jahi* "O Soma Pavamāna, thou art dear to Indra and intoxicating. Making a loud sound, destroy all (our)enemies"; 9, 70, 5 explained below and other similar verses.

(7) 9, 70, 5 : sa marmṛjāna indriyāya dhāyasa
obhe antā rodasī harṣate hitaḥ |
vṛṣā śuṣmeṇa bādhate vi durmatīr
ādediśānaḥ śaryaheva śurudhaḥ ||

"He (Soma), being purified for Indra's drinking, rejoices, being placed in the midst of heaven and earth. The bull drives away the evil-minded with his roar, like a bow-man reviling (enemy-) troops". The meaning of pāda d is uncertain, and the translation given above is only tentative.

(8) 9, 71, 1 : ā dakṣiṇā sṛjyate śuṣmy āsadaṃ
veti druho rakṣasaḥ pāti jāgṛviḥ |
harir opaśaṃ kṛṇute nabhas paya
upastire camvor brahma nirṇije||

"The cow (the milk) is released; roaring he goes to his abode, the vigilant one protects from malignant demons. The tawny one makes a head-ornament of the sky, a carpet of the water in the two jars, and an ornament of the hymn". Compare in connection with the second half-verse 9, 69, 5: *divas pṛṣthaṃ barhaṇā nirṇije kṛtopastaraṇaṃ camvor nabhas-*

*mayam*; the expression *divas pṛṣṭham* in this verse corresponds to *nabhas* in our verse and *upastaraṇam camvor nabhasmayam* to *paya upastire camvoḥ*.

(9) 9, 63, 29: apaghnant soma rakṣaso
'bhy arṣa kanikradat |
dyumantaṃ śuṣmam uttamam ||

" Rush forward, O Soma, destroying demons, and roaring a glorious most mighty roar".

With regard to the expression *dyumantaṃ śuṣmam*, compare 10, 84, 4: *dyumantaṃ ghoṣaṃ vijayāya kṛṇmahe*; 10,98,2: *dadhāmi te dyumatīṃ vācam āsan*; 10, 98, 3: *asme dhehi dyumatīṃ vācam āsan*; 8, 101, 7: *ā me vacāṃsy udyatā dyumattamāni*; 1, 28, 5: *iha dyumattamaṃ vada jayatām iva dundubhiḥ*; 1, 138, 2: *asmākam āṅgūṣān dyumninas kṛdhi* and other similar passages. 'Glorious', here, is equivalent to 'loud'. Compare the observations of Pischel in ZDMG. 35 p. 718ff.

(10) 9, 67, 3: tvaṃ suṣvāṇo adribhir
abhy arṣa kanikradat |
dyumantaṃ śuṣmam uttamam ||

" Being pressed by stones, (O Soma), rush forward, roaring a glorious most mighty roar".

(11) 9, 88, 7: śuṣmī śardho na mārutaṃ pavasvā-
nabhiśastā divyā yathā viṭ |
āpo na makṣū sumatir bhavā naḥ
sahasrāpsāḥ pṛtanāṣāṇ na yajñaḥ ||

" Pass through the filter (O Soma) that makest a loud sound like the host of Maruts, that art unblemished like the divine clan. Be gracious to us, thou that art as swift as the Waters, that hast many ornaments like the sacrifice, and that art conqueror of armies".

There are four similes in this verse. Regarding the loud sound made by Soma and by the Maruts, see the observations under No. 5 above and No. 17 below. With respect to the simile in pāda b, compare the epithets *anavadya* and *anindya*, both signifying 'unblemished' that are applied to Soma in 9, 69, 10;

*indav indrāya bṛhate pavasva sumṛḷīko anavadyo riśādāḥ* and 9, 82, 4: *antar vāṇīṣu pracarāsu jīvase 'nindyo vṛjane soma jāgṛhi*, and on the other, the epithet *anavadya* applied to the gods in 7, 91, 1: *kuvid aṅga namasā ye vṛdhāsaḥ purā devā anavadyāsa āsan.* Since the host ot Maruts is already mentioned in pāda a, I look on *divyā viṭ* as an epuivalent of *devāḥ* or gods in general.

Regarding the simile in pāda c, compare in connection with the swiftness of the Waters, 7, 18, 15: *āpo na sṛṣṭā adhavanta nīcīḥ* 'they ran like waters set free down an incline'; 8, 13, 8: *krīḷanty asya sūnṛtā āpo na pravatā yatīḥ* 'his favours bound forward (as swiftly) as waters going down an incline'; 9, 95, 3: *apām ived ūrmayas tarturāṇāḥ* 'speeding like waves of waters'; and in respect of the swiftness of the Soma juice the numerous passages like 9, 10, 1: *pra svānāso rathā ivārvanto na śravasyavaḥ | somāso rāye akramuḥ* 'The Soma juices ran for wealth, (swiftly), like chariots that have been let go in the race, like horses desirous of winning the prize; 9, 68, 1: *pra devam acchā madhumanta indavo 'siṣyadanta gāva ā na dhenavaḥ* 'The sweet Soma juices ran to the god like milch-cows to their calves'; 9, 69, 6: *sūryasyeva raśmayo drāvayitnavaḥ....īrate* 'The Soma juices move swiftly like the rays of the sun'; 9, 71, 6: *śyeno na yoniṃ . . . āsadaṃ deva eṣati* 'The god Soma goes to the abode as swiftly as the falcon to its nest; 9, 97, 28: *aśvo na krado . . . siṃho na bhīmo manaso javīyān* 'Thou O Soma didst cry like a horse, thou that art fierce like a wild beast (*i.e.* a lion) more swift than the mind' that occur in the ninth maṇḍala. The comparison of the Soma juice with the Waters is found in 9, 6, 4: *anu drapsāsa indava āpo na pravatā saran*; 9, 24, 2: *abhi gāvo adhanviṣur āpo na pravatā yatīḥ | punānā indram āśata* and 9, 69, 7: *sindhor iva pravaṇe nimna āśavo vṛṣacyutā madāso gātum āśata* also.

The ornaments of the sacrifice that are alluded to in pāda d are the pressing-stones, the sacrificial fire, the deities that

grace the sacrifice by their presence, the horses that draw their chariot, etc. Compare the following verses in which the epithet *adhvaraśrī* 'ornament of the sacrifice' is applied to them: 1, 44, 3: *dhūmaketuṃ bhārjīkaṃ vyuṣṭiṣu yajñānām adhvaraśriyam* addressed to Agni; 1, 47, 8: *arvāñcā vāṃ saptayo' dhvaraśriyo vahantu savaned upa* referring to the horses of the Aśvins; 8, 4, 14: *arvāñcaṃ tvā saptayo 'dhvaraśriyo vahantu savaned upa* referring to the horses of Indra; 10, 36, 8: *apāṃ peruṃ jīvadhanyaṃ bharāmahe devāvyaṃ suhavam adhvaraśriyam* addressed to Soma and 10, 66, 8: *dhṛtavratāḥ kṣatriyā yajña-niṣkṛto bṛhaddivā adhvarāṇām abhiśriyaḥ* addressed to the Viśvedevas. The ornaments of Soma are the hymns that praise him, the waters, milk and curds that are used for admixture, the woollen sieve in which the juice is filtered, etc. Compare 9, 40, 1: *śumbhanti vipraṃ dhītibhiḥ* 'they adorn the wise one with hymns'; 9, 68, 9: *adbhir gobhir mṛjyate adribhiḥ sutaḥ* 'Soma, pressed by the stones, is adorned with waters and cows (*i.e.*, milk and curds)'; 9, 16, 6: *punāno rūpe avyaye viśvā arṣann abhi śriyaḥ* 'being filtered in the ornament of sheep's wool, and running towards all the ornaments'. The comparison of Soma with the sacrifice is found in 9, 10, 3 also: *rājāno na praśastibhiḥ somāso gobhir añjate| yajño na sapta dhātṛbhiḥ* also.

With respect to the epithet *sahasrāpsāḥ* of *yajña* in pāda d, compare the epithet *purupeśasam* that is likewise applied to *yajña* in 3, 3, 6: *tanvāno yajñaṃ purupeśasaṃ dhiyā*; and regarding the epithet *pṛtanāṣāṭ* that is applied to Soma, compare 1, 175, 2: *ā nas te gantu matsaro vṛṣā mado vareṇyaḥ| sahāvāñ indra sānasiḥ pṛtanāṣāḷ amartyaḥ* "O Indra, may our intoxicating, desirable, excellent Soma, divine, over-powering, wealth-winning and conquering (hostile) armies, go to thee".

(12) 9, 18, 7: sa śuṣmī kalaśeṣv ā
punāno acikradat |
madeṣu sarvadhā asi ||

"That roarer (*sc.* Soma), being filtered in the jars, roared. In intoxication, thou art the giver of all".

(13) 9, 27, 6: eṣa śuṣmy aśiṣyadad
antarikṣe vṛṣā hariḥ |
punāna indur indram ā ||

"This strong tawny horse, Soma, roaring, rushed in the sky, being filtered for the sake of Indra".

(14) 9, 28, 6: eṣa śuṣmy adābhyaḥ
somaḥ punāno arṣati |
devāvīr aghaśaṃsahā ||

"This Soma, who is not to be deceived, being filtered, rushed forward roaring, destroying slanderers and delighting gods".

(15) 9, 30, 1: pra dhārā asya śuṣmiṇo
vṛthā pavitre akṣaran |
punāno vācam iṣyati ||

"The streams of this roaring (Soma) flowed swiftly on to the filter; being filtered, he raises his voice (*i.e.*, makes a loud sound)".

(16) 9, 41, 3: śṛṇve vṛṣṭer iva svanaḥ
pavamānasya śuṣmiṇaḥ |
patanti vidyuto divi ||

"The sound of the roaring Soma who is being filtered is heard like that of rain; lightnings fly in heaven (*i.e.*, the sound of rain falling and of thunder-bolts is heard when the Soma juices rush through the filter)".

(17) 1, 165, 1: kayā śubhā savayasaḥ sanīḷāḥ
samānyā marutaḥ saṃ mimikṣuḥ |
kayā matī kuta etāsa ete
'rcanti śuṣmaṃ vṛṣaṇo vasūyā ||

According to Kātyāyana's *Sarvānukramaṇī*, hymn 1, 165 is a dialogue between Agastya, Indra and the Maruts, and the above verse, the first in the hymn, as also the next was spoken by Indra. The story in connection with this hymn is related in KS. X, 11 (I, p. 139-11f.) as follows: *agastyo vai marud-*

*bhyaḥ śataṃ ukṣṇaḥ pṛśnīn praukṣat tān indrāyālabhata taṃ marutaḥ kruddhā vajram udyatyābhy-apatan sa etat sūktam apaśyat tenainān aśamayat.* See also MS. 2, 1, 8 (II, p. 108ff.), Tāṇḍya Mbr. 21, 14, 5 and Tait. Br. 2, 7, 11, 1.

It is the opinion of Max Müller (SBE. 32, p. 182), Roth (*ibid.*, introd., p. xii) and Grassmann that the first two verses are spoken by the seer of the hymn, Agastya. Ludwig (V. p. 498), however, endorses the opinion of Kātyāyana and Sāyaṇa; so does Geldner also (RV. Über.) in his translation, observing however in the note, that the verse could have been spoken with equal propriety by Agastya also. For my part, I am inclined to believe that the opinion of Kātyāyana is right, and that the circumstances in which the dialogue took place were very similar to those described in the above-cited passage of the KS and that the first two verses were indeed spoken by Indra, who, in a mocking vein, exalted the Maruts and referred to himself in a depreciating manner (cp. his observation in v. 2: *kena mahā manasā rīramāma* 'with what great hymn can we induce the Maruts to stop' in which he identifies himself with a humble sacrificer).[1] I therefore translate the verse as:

"[Indra speaks]: 'With what common ornament with what hymn, have the Maruts, of the same age and having the same nest, joined themselves? For what object have they come? Desirous of wealth, the strong ones sing a loud song".

The ornaments worn by the Maruts are referred to in almost every hymn that is addressed to them; (see in this connection Macdonell Ved. Myth. p. 72) and in 5, 57, 6: *víśvā vaḥ śrī́r ádhi tanū́ṣu pipiśe*, it is said that they wore all ornaments on their persons. These ornaments however could be perceived by every one, and no poet could therefore ask with propriety: 'With what common ornament were the Maruts conjoined?'; nor could any one apply the epithet *samāna* 'common' to the ornaments worn by them. It hence becomes evident that *śubhā* is used in pāda a with a figurative sense, that is, with the sense of 'hymn, song of praise' with which it is often assimilated by the RV poets. Compare 8, 105, 7:

1. Compare 1, 120, 1: kā́ rādhad dhótrā svinā vāṃ kó vāṃ jóṣa ubháyoḥ| kathā́ vidhāty ápracetāḥ in which the seer Kakṣīvān asks "What hymn of praise would please you, O Asvins, what will cause you delight? How should a simple person worship you?" In 1, 164, 1-2, Indra is speaking of himself as an *apracetāḥ*.

*aśvaṃ na gīrbhī rathyaṃ sudānavo marmṛjyante devayavaḥ* 'the pious and liberal (sacrificers) adorn (Agni) with hymns as (one does) a chariot-horse'; 5, 1, 12: *gaviṣṭhiro namasā stomam agnau divīva rukmam uruvyañcam aśret* 'Gaviṣṭhira, with obeisance, put a hymn of praise on Agni as one places the wide-spreading ornament (*i.e.*, the sun) in the sky; 1, 187, 11: *taṃ tvā vayaṃ pito vacobhir gāvo na havyā suṣūdima* 'O food, we have adorned thee with hymns of praise as cows (*i.e.*, ghee, milk and curds) adorn, *i.e.*, sweeten, sacrificial offerings'; 1, 140, 1: *vastreṇeva vāsayā manmanā śuciṃ jyotīrathaṃ śukravarṇaṃ tamohanam* 'attire with a hymn, as if with an ornament, the bright (Agni) of shining colour, the destroyer of darkness, who has a chariot of light'; 8, 14, 26: *agniṃ śumbhāmi manmabhiḥ* 'I adorn Agni with hymns of praise'; 5, 22, 4: *tvā . . . gīrbhiḥ śumbhanty atrayaḥ* 'the Atris adorn thee (sc. Agni) with hymns'. Compare also the other similar passages referred to by Grassmann s. v. *śubh*.

The words *kayā matī* in pāda c are a paraphrase, in unfigurative language, of the words *kayā śubhā* of pāda a; and the question *kayā subhā kayā matī saṃ mimikṣuḥ* of our verse is synonymous with the question *kasya brahmāṇi jujuṣur yuvānaḥ* 'whose hymns do the youths like' in pāda a of verse 2 (next verse) of the same hymn. Similarly, the question *kuta etāsa ete* in pāda c of our verse refers to the same matter as pāda b of verse 2: *ko vo 'dhvare maruta ā vavarta* 'what sacrificer has turned you towards his sacrifice'. The word *kutaḥ* here is not equivalent to *kasmād deśāt* as Sāyaṇa and others interpret, but to *kasmāt kāraṇāt* 'for what reason, why'; compare the word *ataḥ* in the Maruts' reply (v. 5) which Geldner has correctly explained as 'for this reason'. Compare also the word *kutaḥ* used by the Maruts in their question to Indra (v. 3) which Sāyaṇa paraphrases as *kutaḥ kāraṇāt*.

Pādas a, b, c of our verse may thus be said to be synonymous with pādas a, b of verse 2. In both these verses, Indra asks: "The hymns of what sacrificer, O Maruts, have found favour in your eyes? To the sacrifice of what sacrificer are you now going?" As already observed above, Indra is mocking the

(*To be continued.*)

# A NOTE ON TUMAIN INSCRIPTION

BY

B. CH. CHHABRA, *Ootacamund.*

The fragmentary stone inscription, that forms the subject matter of the present note, was discovered by Mr. M. B. Garde, the then Director of Archaeology in Gwalior, in February 1919 at Tumain, ancient Tumbavana. It has been edited by him in the *Epigraphia Indica*[1] 'with full text, translation and facsimile.'

The inscription is dated in the year 116 of the Gupta era and refers itself to the reign of the Gupta monarch Kumāragupta I. It also mentions Ghaṭōtkachagupta who has been supposed to be a younger brother or a son of Kumāragupta I.[2]

The inscribed fragment contains the latter parts of the first[3] six lines of the inscription. Each extant line measures more or less two feet, but, in its entirety, it must, on calculation, have measured about five feet in length. With regard to the first three lines, it can definitely be said that no letter has been lost at the end. The same is most probably the case with the next two lines as well. Considering that all the lines do not end at one and the same point of the margin, it appears that the engraver or the writer took special care to see that each line concluded with the terminus at least of a quarter of a stanza, if not with that of a half or the whole of it. This leads us further to assume that the record terminated in the sixth line itself, which was thus originally the longest, three or four letters having been lost at the end in its present state. According to the learned editor, however, these lost letters formed the beginning of an additional line, for he supposes that 'the missing part had a portion of one more line.'[4]

A more important question to be discussed here, however, concerns the contents. The fragmentary condition of the inscription has apparently been responsible for certain erro-

1. Vol. XXVI, pp. 115-118, and plate.

2. *Ibid.*, p. 116.

3. As it has been shown in this note, the entire record consisted of six lines only.

4. *Ibid.*, p. 115.

neous conclusions. The learned editor maintains that 'the present tense is used in the sense of the historic past in two places: *vandyatē* and *jayati* in line 1.'[1] Noticing the contents of the extant portion of the first line, he says: 'In the genealogical portion, the first existing verse seems to allude to Samudragupta. The next verse eulogises his (son and) successor Chandragupta as one who conquered the earth extending as far as the oceans.'[2] His translation of the passages concerned accords with these remarks.

The text in question has a familiar ring about it. In fact, similar wording may be found in the preamble of many an early inscription, including some of the Gupta records themselves. The famous Junāgaḍh rock inscription of Skandagupta, for instance, opens with an invocation to Vishṇu,....*sa jayati....Vishṇur=*...., and the next following verse hails the king himself, *Tad-anu jayati*....[3] It will thus readily be recognised that the first verse of the Tumain inscription likewise comprised an invocation to some deity, and did not allude to Samudragupta as surmised by the learned editor. This view is further strengthened by the mention of the *siddhas*. These evidently refer to a class of heavenly beings. And it would be improper, in the ordinary course, to describe a king as adored by gods. The learned editor has tried to overcome this awkwardness by taking the *siddhas* in the sense of 'sages', but even that would not be appropriate, unless, of course, the monarch so adored be of the spirituality of Janaka.

From the fact that a single foot, and not a pair of feet, is mentioned in connection with the salutation, I suppose that the deity invoked is the Vāmana incarnation of Vishṇu. An analogous instance is afforded by the Chipḷūṇ plates of Pulikēśin II.[4]

Further, the first verse must also have contained the verb *jayati* in its principal clause, as indicated by the very expression *tad-anu jayati* in the next following stanza. As regards this last, the learned editor has apparently misconstrued the words *Rājā śrī-Chandraguptas=tad-anu jayati yō mēdinīṁ*

---

1. *Ibid.*, p. 115. By 'the historic past' is meant 'the historic present', here.

2. *Ibid.*, p. 116.

3. J. F. Fleet, *CII*, Vol. III (Gupta Inscriptions), p. 59.

4. *Epi. Ind.*, Vol. III, p. 51.

*sāgar-āntām* by translating them as 'After him king *śrī* Chandragupta conquered the earth as far as the oceans.'[1] In consonance with the explanation of the first verse as proposed here, these may better be rendered as 'Next is victorious the glorious king Chandragupta who (*ruled over?*) the earth as far as the oceans!' It is thus clear that the verb *jayati* in the second verse is used intransitively and that the subordinate clause beginning with *yō mēdinīṁ* must have had some such verb as *śaśāsa* further on, in the now missing part of the verse. Such being the case, the use of the present tense in the sense of the historic past or historic present, as noticed by the learned editor, is non-existent in the Tumain inscription.

It may, however, be argued that in the case of the Junāgaḍh inscription the verb *jayati* refers to the king who was then alive and that therefore the use of the present tense there is correct, but how can such a use be justified in the case of the Tumain inscription where *jayati* refers to a then defunct king? It need hardly be pointed out that in such expressions *jayati* implies no tense, the sense of 'hail!' being the uppermost. Instances where it is used in connection with past personages in inscriptions can be multiplied.[2]

According to the learned editor, the king spoken of in the first quarter of the second verse is Chandragupta II, but it is just possible that he is Chandragupta I.[3] The presumption naturally is this that the missing portion of the second verse mentioned also his son, Samudragupta, and grandson, Chandragupta II, the latter of whom is clearly referred to further on, in line 2, in the present inscription as the father of Kumāragupta I. The genealogical list in this inscription would thus have to be taken to commence with Chandragupta I.

It may, by the bye, be added that two of the syllables left unread in the beginning of line 3 seem to read *garbbhā*, the superscript *r* being faint, Of the letters conjecturally read as *bhāva-dhīrāḥ* in line 6, the first appears to be *bhō*. The word may thus be *bhōga* and not *bhāva*. Of those likewise read as

1. *Ibid.*, Vol. XXVI, p. 117.
2. See, for example, *ibid.*, Vol. XXI, p. 94, v. 5.
3. In that case, the possible mention, in the present record, of his sway over an extensive kingdom would lend colour to the identification of the king Chandra of the Mēharaulī posthumous iron pillar inscription with Chandragupta I.

*kētanaṁ* in the same line, the vowel-stroke over the first looks more like *ā* than *ē*. Can the intended reading thus be *dēva-nivāsam=ētam*? That would complete the verse, too. The form *prithivī* in line 4 for the more usual *pṛithivī* seems to be a Gupta speciality. We find it also in the Allahabad pillar inscription of Samudragupta,[1] the Bihār stone pillar inscription of Skandagupta,[2] etc.

1. J. F. Fleet, *CII*, Vol. III (Gupta Inscriptions), p. 8, text line 24.

2. *Ibid.*, p. 49, text line 14.

# GOD PURUSHOTTAMA AT PURI AND CUTTACK

BY

DINES CHANDRA SIRCAR, *Ootacamand.*

In an interesting paper entitled 'The Date of the Jagannātha Temple in Purī, Orissa' published in *J. A. S. B.*, Vol. LXVII, 1898, pp. 328-31, M. M. Chakravarti quoted two verses[1] found in the copper-plate grants[2] of the successors of Anantavarman Choḍagaṅga (1078-1147 A. D.) to show that a great temple was erected in Orissa on or near the sea coast by order of that Gaṅga monarch. He concluded that the temple erected by Choḍagaṅga could be no other that that of the god Purushottama or Jagannātha at Purī. Chakravarti no doubt meant the *vimāna* or sanctum and the *jagamohana* or the first *maṇḍapa* of the Purī temple, as its *Nāṭyaśālā* (now called *Nāṭa-mandira*) and *Bhoga-maṇḍapa* were erected at a much later date.[3] He further pointed to a pilgrimage to Purushottama

---

1· *Pādau yasya dhar-āntariksham=akhilaṁ nābhis=tu sarvā diśaḥ śrotre netra-yugaṁ rav-īndu-yugalaṁ murdh=āpi cha dyaur=asau | prāsādaṁ Purushottamasya ṇripatiḥ kō nāma karttuṁ kshamas=tasy=ety=ādya-ṇripair=upekshitam=ayaṁ chakre=tha Gaṅg-eśvaraḥ || Lakshmī-janma-gṛihaṁ payo-nidhir=asau saṁbhāvitasya sthitir=no dhāmni śvaśurasya pujyata iti kshīr-ābdhi-vāsād=dhruvam | nirviṇṇaḥ Purushōttamaḥ pramuditas = tad-vāsa-lābhād = Ramā = py=etad=bhartṛi-gṛihaṁ-varaṁ pitṛi-gṛihāt prāpya pramod-ānvitā ||*

Translation: "What king can be named that could erect a temple to such a god as Purushottama, whose feet are the earth, whose navel the entire sky, whose ears the cardinal points, whose eyes the sun and moon and whose head that heaven above? This task which had been hitherto neglected by previous kings, was fulfilled by the lord of the Gaṅgas (*i.e.* Choḍagaṅga).

"The ocean is the birth-place of Lakshmī; so thinking, in his father-in-law's house Vishṇu lodged with some shame, though he got full adoration. Thus ashamed, the god Purushottama was glad to get this new house; and Lakshmī, too, gladly preferred living in her husband's new house to living in her father's house".

2. Cf. *J. A. S. B.*, Vol. LXIV, 1895, p. 139; Vol. LXV, 1896, p. 240.

3. Cf. R.D. Banerji, *History of Orissa*, Vol. I, 251.

(*i.e.*, Purī, otherwise called Purushottama-purī, Purushottama-kshetra, Jagannātha-purī, etc.) referred to in the Govindapur (Gaya District) inscription of Śaka 1059 (1137-38 A.D.)[1] and to the god Purushottama existing in the vicinity of the eastern ocean mentioned in the Nagpur inscription of the Pramāras of Malwa, dated in Vikrama Samvat 1161 (1104-05 A.D.)[2], in connection with the *digvijaya* of Paramāra Lakshadeva (whose known date is Vikrama Samvat 1151=1084-85 A.D.) and suggested that the Purī temple might have been built in 1085-90 shortly after Choḍagaṅga's conquest of that part of Orissa early in his reign before 1085 A.D. Elsewhere[3] the same scholar drew attention to the astronomical work *Bhāsvatī* which was composed in Śaka 1021 (1099-1100 A.D.), according to the *Sūryasiddhānta*, by one Śatānanda of Purushottama (Purī) who is said by the commentator to have based his calculations on the meridian of his native city.

In this connection it may be pointed out that the Gaṅgas were Śaivas being devoted to Gokarṇeśvara (Śiva) installed in a temple on the top of the Mahendragiri peak in the Ganjam District. Anantavarman Choḍagaṅga is also described as a *parama-māheśvara* (*i.e.*, devout worshipper of Maheśvara or Śiva) in his earlier copper-plate grants[4]; but the Korni plates[5] of Śaka 1034 (1112-13 A.D.) describe him both as a *parama-māheśvara* and as a *parama-vaishṇava* (devout worshipper of Vishṇu), while the Vizagapatam plates[6] of 1040 (1118-19 A.D.) omit *parama-māheśvara* and call him a devotee of Vishṇu only. It is interesting to note that both these grants refer to the conquest of the Utkala country by Choḍagaṅga apparently from the Somavaṁśīs[7] whose dominions in Utkala

1. *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. II, p. 334. *Purī* is a contraction of *Purushottama-Purī* or *Jagannatha-purī*, while *Purushottama* is a similar contraction of *Purushottama-purī* or *Purushottama-kshetra*. Cf. *Satyabhāmā Saty=eti* and *Satyabhāmā Bhām=eti* of the *Mahābhāshya*.

2 *Ibid.*, p. 187.

3. *J.A.S.B.*, 1903, p. 110.

4. Cf. the Korni and Vizagapatam plates of Śaka 1003 (1081-82 A.D.) in *J. A. H. R. S.*, Vol. I, pp. 40-48; *Ind. Ant.*, Vol. XVIII, pp, 61-65. Choḍagaṅga conquered Utkala after 1081-82 A.D and before 1112-13 A.D.

5. *J. A. H. R. S.*, Vol. I, pp. 113-24.

6. *Ind. Ant.*, Vol. XVIII, pp. 165-72.

7. *I. H. Q.*, Vol. XXII, pp. 300-07.

comprised the Purī District. It is therefore probable that Choḍagaṅga's conquest of Utkala had something to do with his change of religious faith from Śaivism to Vaishṇavism. Another interesting fact is that, unlike the earlier grants, these later records do not copy the genealogical portion from the copper-plate inscriptions of Choḍagaṅga's grandfather Vajrahasta III Anantavarman (1038-70 A.D.)[1] but that they offer a more elaborate genealogy apparently fabricated by Choḍagaṅga's court poets. This forged genealogy is important in regard to the king's leaning towards Vaishṇavism as it traces the descent of his family to the god Vishṇu.[2]

Another interesting information about the god Purushottama or Jagannātha at Purī seems to be supplied by the passage of the verses quoted above saying that the task of building a temple for the god Purushottama was neglected by the previous kings of the Purī region and that therefore Choḍagaṅga took it up and fulfilled it. This no doubt suggests that the god Purushottama was being worshipped at Purī before the date of Choḍagaṅga's conquest of that region, but that the Somavaṁśīs, whom the Gaṅga king ousted, being staunch devotees of the god Śiva[3], neglected constructing a suitable temple for Purushottama. Apparently the deity at Purī, like Veṅkaṭeśvara-Bālājī at Tirupati, Mīnākshī at Madura Vindhyavāsinī near Mirzapur, Kāmākhyā near Gauhati and numerous other gods and goddesses in different parts of India, was originally being worshipped by the aboriginal inhabitants of the locality and came gradually to be identified with a god of the recognised Brahmanical pantheon.[4] But the identification of Purushottama or Jagannātha of Purī with the Brah-

---

1. Cf. the Nadagam plates, *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. IV, 18: ff.

2. It must be admitted that the Vizagapatam plates of Śaka 1057 (1135-36 A.D.) describe Choḍagaṅga as a *parama-māheśvara* and do neither refer to his suzerainty over Utkala nor offer the fabricated genealogy (*Int. Ant.*, XVIII, pp. 472-76). But I have doubts that, in the date of this inscription, the word *kara* (*i.e.*, 2) has been wrongly read as *sa*(*śa*)*ra* (*i.e.*, 5) and that the date should probably be Śaka 1027 (1005-06 A.D.) instead of Śaka 1057 (1135-36 A.D.).

3. The Somavaṁśī kings are described as *parama-māheśvara* in their inscriptions.

4. Cf *J. R. A. S. B.*, Letters, Vol. XIV, 1948, pp. 103-06.

manical god Vishṇu seems to have been fully recognised before Choḍagaṅga's occupation of the Purī region.

The celebrated Oriya chronicle called *Mādalā-pāñjī*, however, attributes the construction of the temple of Purushottama-Jagannātha not to Anantavarman Choḍagaṅga but to his great-grandson Anaṅgabhīma III (1211-38 A.D.) and it is usually believed by scholars that the Purī temple and the buildings connected with the shrine "may have been actually finished during his reign."[1] We have elsewhere[2] seen that Anaṅgabhīma III was a staunch devotee of the god Purushottama and considered the deity as the *de jure* lord of his dominions and himself as a mere deputy of the god. It has also been shown that probably all his successors (definite evidence being available only for his great-great-grandson Bhānu II, 1305-27 A.D.) ruled their dominions as subordinates of the theoretical overlord Purushottama-Jagannātha of Purī. But whether the dedication of the Gaṅga kingdom to the above god took place during the rule of Anaṅgabhīma III or during that of his father, grandfather or great-grandfather cannot be definitely determined in the present state of our knowledge, although there is no evidence at our disposal to support the second alternative. If Anaṅgabhīma III was the first Gaṅga monarch to have dedicated his kingdom to the god Purushottama, he must have been regarded as the most remarkable royal devotee of the deity and popular tradition may have attributed to him, wrongly of course, his great-grandfather's achievement of building the temple for the god. But another fact seems to lie at the root of the confusion. There is evidence to show that Anaṅgabhīma III installed an image of the god Purushottma-Jagannātha in a temple at Cuttack[3] which became the later

---

1. Ray, *Dynastic History of Northern India*, Vol. I, p. 478.

2. *J. K. H. R. S.*, Vol. I, pp. 251-53.

3. The city is called Vārāṇasī-kaṭaka in the Gaṅga inscriptions and Banārasī in the Muslim chronicles. See Ray, *op. cit.*, pp. 491-94. As will be seen below, this city called 'New Banāras' was already the residence of the Gaṅga king during the reign of Anaṅgabhīma III. As *Purī* is a contraction of *Purushottama-purī* or *Jagannātha-purī*, *Kaṭaka* (Cuttack) is an abbreviation of *Vārāṇasī-kaṭaka* or *Abhinava-Vārāṇasī-kaṭaka*. For Aṭak-Banāras, named by Akbar after Kaṭak-Banāras, see *Akbar-nāma* (trans.), Vol. III, pp. 520-21; *Muntakhabut Tawārīkh* (trans.), Vol. II, p. 301.

capital of the Gaṅga kings who were originally ruling from Kaliṅganagara (modern Mukhalingam in the Ganjam Dist.). We know that Śivajī's patron-deity was the goddess Bhavānī at Tuljapur near Osmananabad in the modern Hyderabad State; but, since Tuljapur was not within easy reach to him, Śivājī, when he built the fort of Pratāpgarh near Javli, set up there a new image of his patron deity.[1] The Gaṅga king Anaṅga-bhīma III seems to have similarly set up an image of his patron-deity Purushottama-Jaganātha at his capital at Cuttack owing to his desire to live constantly near the god.

That there was a temple of Jagannātha (Purushottama) at Banārasī (*i.e.*, Vārāṇasī-kaṭaka or the present Cuttack), capital of Jājnagar (*i.e.*, the Orissan kingdom of the Gaṅgas) was long ago known from the *Tarīkh-i-Fīrūz Shāhī* of Shams-i-Sirāj. According to this work[2], Sultān Fīrūz Shāh of Delhi led an expedition against the kingdom of Jājnagar (the Gaṅga kingdom) about 1360 A.D. when that kingdom was under the rule of Bhāndeo, *i. e.*, Bhānudeva III (1352-78 A.D.), who had his head-quarters at Banārasī (*i.e.*, Vārāṇasī-kaṭaka or the present Cuttack). The Sultān is said to have occupied Banārasī when the king fled from the capital. In connection with this expedition, the *Ta'rīkh-i-Fīrūz Shāhī* says, "It is reported that, inside the Rāī's fort (*i.e.*, king Bhānu's fort at Banārasī or Cuttack), there was a stone idol which the infidels called Jagannāth and to which they paid their devotions. Sultān Fīrūz in emulation of Maḥmūd-i-Subuk-tigīn, having rooted up the idol, carried it away to Delhi, where he subsequently had it placed in an ignominious position". Recently evidence has come to light to show that this image of Jagannātha (Purushottama) at Cuttack was installed by the Gaṅga king Anaṅga-bhīma III.

Sometime ago, a new set of copper-plates reached Mr. Harekrishna Mahatab, Chief Minister of Orissa, and I received it for examination through the kindness of Mr. Paramananda Acharya and Mr. Krishna Chandra Panigrahi of the Orissa Provincial Museum, Bhubaneswar. This interesting record belongs to the Gaṅga king Anaṅgabhīma III and gives details

2. *See* J.N. Sarkar, *History of Aurangzeb*, Vol. IV, p. 32.

3. *See* Elliot, *The History of India as told by its own Historians*, Vol. III, pp. 312-15.

of a number of grants made by the king in favour of several Brāhmaṇas. We have to analyse them before discussing the light the record throws on the problem under discussion.

I. On the occasion of the Mīna-saṁkrānti on Saturday, Chaitra sudi 9, in the Śaka year 1151, king Anaṅgabhīma-rāutta-deva, while he was taking a bath in the Mahānadī between the temples of Chitrēśvara and Viśvesvara at Abhinava-Vārāṇasī-kaṭaka (literally, at the camp or residence of 'New Banāras'), granted twenty *vāṭīs* of land at Pūraṇagrāma in the Sāïlo *vishaya* (district) to a Brāhmaṇa named Saṅkarshaṇānanda Śarman. The date of the grant corresponds to the 23rd February, 1230 A.D.

II. Next year (*i.e.*, in Śaka 1152) on Thursday, Māgha badi 6, while the king was taking a bath in the same river, he granted a township covering 30 *vāṭīs* of land in the villages of Pūraṇagrāma and Jayanagaragrāma in the same *vishaya* to the same Brāhmaṇa Saṅkarshaṇānanda Śarman. The date corresponds to Thursday the 26th December, 1230 A.D. which was the day of the Makara-saṁkrānti.

III. In the same year (*i.e.*, Śaka 1152) king Anaṅgabhīma III also made the following gifts:

(a) While he was taking a bath in the Mahānadī, on the occasion of a lunar eclipse on Thursday, Mārgaśīrsha sudi 15, he granted 18 *vāṭīs* of land in the said Pūraṇagrāma to Dīkshita Rudrapāṇi Śarman. The date corresponds to the 21st November, 1230 A.D.

(b) On the occasion of the Makara-saṁkrānti (Thursday, the 26th December, 1230 A.D.) he granted 5 *vāṭīs* of land apparently in the same village to the Brāhmaṇa Somapāla Śarman.

(c) He granted, on the occasion of the installation of the god Purushottama, 2 *vāṭīs* of land apparently in the same village to the Brāhmaṇa Chandrakara Śarman.

IV. Apparently in the same year (Śaka 1152), on the occasion of a solar eclipse on Karkaṭak-āmāvāsyā[1], while the

1. In Śaka 1152, the Karkaṭak-āmāvāsyā fell on Thursday the 11th July, 1230 A.D. According to Svamikannu Pillai's *Indian Ephemeris*, there was a solar eclipse this year on the Vṛishabh-āmāvāsyā (Tuesday the 14th May, 1230 A.D.) and not on the Karkaṭak-āmāvāsyā day. Thus *Vṛishabh-āmāvāsyā* may be intended in the inscription in the place of *Karkaṭak-āmāvāsyā*.

king was at Purushottama-kshetra (*i.e.*, Purī) on the bank of the southern ocean, he granted 5 *vāṭīs* in the same Pūraṇa-grama to Kāyaḍī Śarman and some other Brāhmaṇas.

V. Apparently in the same year (Śaka 1152) when the king was standing before the god Purushottama at Abhinava-Vārāṇasī (New Banāras or Cuttack)[1] on the occasion of the Makar-āmāvasyā on Sunday, he granted 4 *vāṭīs* of land in Vilāsapuragrāma in the Kuddiṇḍā *vishaya* to the Brāhmaṇa Devadhara Śarman. The date corresponds to the 5th January 1231 A.D.

It will be seen from the details quoted above that they refer to a deity called Purushottama at Cuttack and to its installation not very long before Sunday the Makar-āmāvasyā day in Śaka 1152, corresponding to the 5th January 1231 A.D, no doubt by king Anaṅgabhīma III (1211-38 A.D.). This Purushottama-Jagannātha was worshipped at Cuttack for 130 years and was desecrated by Sultān Fīrūz Shāh about 1360 A. D.

1. The inscription has *Abhinava-Vārāṇasyāṁ bhagavataḥ śrī-Purushottama devasya sannidhau.*

# GAṄGA ARKEŚVARA OF ORISSA

BY

DINES CHANDRA SIRCAR, *Ootacamund.*

For the compilation of a comprehensive history of Orissa, the Utkal University, Cuttack, has constituted a committee and Mr. Sadāśiva Ratha Śarmā of Purī has been appointed Research Assistant to go round different parts of Orissa and collect materials. In his tour in the Ganjam District, Mr. Ratha Śarmā secured a set of copper-plates from a village called Polsara on the 7th of August, 1949. He found the inscription with a person named Dwitiya Parida who had discovered it while cultivating a piece of land about the beginning of May, 1949. The inscription is now the property of the Utkal University. In December, 1949, I received the plates for examination from Mr. Chintāmaṇi Āchārya, Vice-Chancellor of the Utkal University. I thank Mr. Āchārya for his kindness in allowing me to publish the inscription and hasten to place before scholars the new information supplied by the record before properly editing the complete text of the epigraph.

The inscription records the grant of one-half of a village called Valigrāma situated in the Varttani *vishaya* forming part of the Jhāḍakhaṇḍa *deśa* in favour of a Brāhmaṇa by a king named Arkeśvara who was the son of Pramāḍi and grandson of *Paramabhaṭṭāraka* Guṇārṇava, described as a member of the Gaṅga family and as a devotee of Maheśvara (Śiva). The grant was made on the occasion of a lunar eclipse on Friday which was the full-moon day of Māgha in the king's 24th regnal year when the king, accompanied by his wife Śriyādevī, came to the banks of the Ṛishikulyā river from the Hiṅgulā *kaṭaka*. Apparently the royal consorts were residing at Hiṅgulā, probably not far from the Ṛishikulyā, and came to the river for a bath on the occasion of the eclipse.

The date of the charter as given at the end of the record is the year 4248 or 4348 of the Yugābda, *i.e.* the Kaliyuga era. The alternate reading is due to the second figure of the date, written like the English numeral 3, which is known to have been used in inscriptions and manuscripts to indicate 2 in some cases but 3 in others. Thus the year corresponds either to A.D. 1147 or to A.D. 1247. Now on the 13th of Decem-

ber in the year 1247 A.D. there was actually a lunar eclipse on the full-moon day of Māgha falling on Friday, while in 1147 A.D. the Māgha full-moon no doubt began on a Friday, but there was no lunar eclipse on that date. That the figure in question has to be read in medieval Orissan records not as 2 but as 3 is also suggested by the Kendupatna plates of Narasiṁha II dated in Śaka 1217 (*J. A. S. B.*, Vol. LXV, 1896, Past i, Plate X, left margin). Thus the Gaṅga king Arkeśvara seems to have ruled from A.D. 1224 to a date later than the 13th December, 1247 A.D.

Now the problem is that Arkeśvara seems to have been ruling contemporaneously with the imperial Gaṅga monarchs Anaṅgabhīma III (circa 1211-38 A.D.) and his son Narasiṁha I (circa 1238-64 A.D.). Since however no royal or imperial epithets are used in our record with the names of Arkeśvara and his father Pramāḍi, they may probably be regarded as subordinates to the imperial Gaṅgas, although the issue of a charter without any reference to the overlord is rather difficult to explain in this case. Arkeśvara's grandfather Guṇārṇava is endowed with the imperial epithet *Paramabhaṭṭāraka*. But whether this is to be regarded as an improper use of the imperial title or this Guṇārṇava has to be identified with one of the known monarchs of the imperial Gaṅga house is difficult to determine. We know that kings of the Gaṅga house of Śvetaka were ruling side by side with the Gaṅga rulers of Kaliṅganagara for a long time. A late member of the Śvetaka branch of the Gaṅga family may have been Devendravarman who was an early contemporary of the mighty Anantavarman Choḍagaṅga (1078-1147 A.D.) and is known from several sources. It may not be impossible that Arkeśvara was a descendant of this Devendravarman. In any case the problems raised by the Polsara inscription of Arkeśvara are worthy of serious consideration of the students of ancient Orissan history and I shall be grateful to receive any suggestion that may help us in solving them.

An interesting point about the inscription is the use of the Kaliyuga era in the date instead of the Gaṅga or the Śaka era. This is rather unusual. The reason of Arkeśvara's preference of the Kaliyuga era can hardly be determined in the present state of our knowledge. May it be due to the special importance attached by the king to the auspiciousness of the occasion of the grant?

# THE ARTISTRY OF KALIDASA.*

BY

SRI R. RANGACHARI,

*Asst. Secretary, Finance Dept., Govt. of Madras.*

या वर्णपदवाक्यार्थस्वरूपेणैव वर्तते ।

अनादिनिधनानन्ता सा मां पातु सरस्वती ॥

It used to be said that a poet, like a prophet, is without honour in his own country, at least in his time. Denied his meed of recognition, did not even the great poet, Bhavabhuti, console himself by saying—

उत्पत्स्यते मम तु कोऽपि समानधर्मा

कालो ह्ययं निरवधिः विपुला च पृथ्वी ॥

"An age must dawn when there shall walk a man,
A kindred spirit, whose heart in unison
Will beat with mine and he, when I am gone,
Must accept me truly—as but such souls can,
For the world is wide and Time no one may span."

We flatter ourselves to-day that we are better than our forbears in this respect. We ask—Do we not now honour our poets in their own life-time? Yes, we do, but there is a danger to be guarded against. Under present conditions, it is quite possible for inferior poetry to be boosted as the greatest for all time and clime. Though we may not cling to an old work of art simply because it is old, we may not likewise get enamoured of a new one simply because it is new. As Ruskin says, inferior poetry is the enemy of good poetry. If low standards are set up, will it be possible to appreciate really good poetry that endures for ever? It is therefore well for this Academy and sister-institutions to draw attention periodically to our good poets of old.

Among the pre-eminent poets of Bharata Varsha, Kalidasa holds a supreme place, next only to that of Valmiki. It gives me some cheer to find that Kalidasa, Tagore and Shakespeare were remembered at the recent Bharathi Memorial celebrations

---

* Paper read at the Kālidāsa Day Celebrations of the Madras Samskrita Academy, on 2-10-1949.

at Ettayapuram, though Valmiki was lost sight of. The only way to honour a poet's memory is to understand his message aright and re-create it for ourselves through a proper appreciation of his work. The souls of our great ones would writhe in torment, if we misread them or exploit them for our own ends, in the guise of doing honour to them. We get a glimpse of this, when Valmiki describes Sita sitting desolate in the Asokavana as being—

यथा वाचम् अर्थान्तरं गताम् ।

To understand a poet aright, one has to be a true poet himself. Till Goethe and Tagore brought out the true significance of Kalidasa's treatment of the love theme in Sakuntalam, he used to be thought of as an arch delineator of the Sringararasa only. What Kalidasa was concerned to show in Sakuntalam as well as in his Kumarasambhavam was the futility of carnal passion as opposed to the perfect union of kindred souls through penance and suffering. Here let me recall the beautiful prayer of Appayya Dikshita addressed to Parvati-Parameswara:

परस्परतपस्संपत्फलायितपरस्परौ ।
प्रपञ्चमातापितरौ प्राञ्चौ जायापती स्तुमः ॥

What a beautiful idea this—Each of the Divine Pair deserving the other as the fruit of penance! Vedantadesika also speaks of Vishnu and Sri as—द्वन्द्वमन्योन्यलक्ष्यम्

With your leave, I shall now, within the brief time at my disposal, invite your attention to a few passages in the Abhijnana Sakuntalam and add a running commentary thereon, to bring out the true artistry of Kalidasa. Let me at the outset disclaim any idea of telling you what you do not know already and that better. As Sita said to Rama,

स्नेहाच्च बहुमानाच्च स्मारये [त्वाम् ] न शिक्षये ।

I shall but refresh your memory.

Act V deals with the coming of Sakuntala to Dushyanta's palace and his repudiation of her—the beginning of suffering to both. How inimitably does the Poet prepare us for this sorrow, by making Dushyanta say at the outset that he feels sad, even in the midst of pleasant surroundings!—

रम्याणि वीक्ष्य मधुरांश्च निशम्य शब्दान्
पर्युत्सुको भवति यत्सुखितोऽपि जन्तुः ।

तच्चेतसा स्मरति नूनमबोधपूर्वं
भावस्थिराणि जननान्तरसौहृदानि ॥

Rasikas may remember that Shakespeare begins his play "Merchant of Venice" by making Antonio exclaim, "In sooth, I know not, why I am so sad". I am also reminded here of the words of James H. Cousins in his poem, "Adrift in Moonlight";—

"A sadness caught from other years,
Too vague for words, too sweet for tears".

Again how simply does the Poet paint a grand picture of Dushyanta firmly rooted in Dharma, contending against the dictates of his heart, in the dialogue between him, the sages and Sakuntala!

When first Dushyanta met Sakuntala in Kanva's hermitage and found his heart leaning towards her, he at once questioned himself as to whether that was proper and concluded that it should be right, because for noble-minded persons, the inner heart would ever point towards righteousness.

सतां हि संदेहपदेषु वस्तुषु प्रमाणमन्तःकरणप्रवृत्तयः ।

Yet he would not commit himself to any rash act, till he had made sure that it was really all right. Dushyanta's frame of mind in repudiating Sakuntala is the same. Alas, fain would I listen to the dictates of my heart asking me to believe in the sage's daughter, if I had the least remembrance of having met her before!

कामं प्रत्यादिष्टां स्मरामि न परिग्रहं मुनेस्तनयाम् ।
बलवत्तु दूयमानं प्रत्याययतीव मे हृदयम् ॥

What a strange fit of forgetfulness, induced by a curse! It requires some strong link with the past to open the floodgates of memory. This is provided by the discovery of Dushyanta's ring. At the sight of the ring, memories came crowding in and the King was lost in thought. He could not speak for long, but could only weep.

मुहूर्तं प्रकृतिगम्भीरोऽपि पर्यश्रुनयन आसीत् ।

What a true understanding of the human heart does the Poet display by his restraint here! We may recall the similar plight of Rama on receiving Sita's Choodamani.

तं मणिं हृदये कृत्वा प्ररुरोद सलक्ष्मणः ।

.... .... राघवः शोककर्शितः ॥

I should like to refer here also to a passage in the Tamil Classic Silappathikaram: Kovalan deserts his beloved Madhavi due to a misunderstanding and sets out with his lawful wife Kannaki to start life anew at Madhurai. He leaves his wife on the outskirts of the city and goes out in the twilight to a lake nearby, when a messenger from Madhavi hands him a palm-leaf roll. The mud seal on this roll has been fixed by Madhavi with her scented hair. This scent revives sweet memories of old in Kovalan's heart and he stands lost in thought without breaking the seal. The Poet says :—

போதவிழ் புரிகுழல் பூங்கொடிநங்கை
மாதவியோலை மலர்க்கையினீட்ட
உடனுறை காலத்துரைத் தருநெய்வாசங்
குறுநெறிக்கூந்தல் மண் பொதிபுணர்த்திக்
காட்டியதாதலிற்கைவிடலீயான்.

Turning to Dushyanta, when he regains consciousness as it were, he is appalled at his repudiation of Sakuntala. He says to his friend :—

इतः प्रत्यादेशात्स्वजनमनुगन्तुं व्यवसिता
स्थिता तिष्ठेत्युच्चैर्वदति गुरुशिष्ये गुरुसमे ।
पुनर्दृष्टिं बाष्पप्रसरकलुषामर्पितवती
मयि क्रूरे यत्तत्सविषमिव शल्यं दहति माम् ॥

"Being repudiated by me, Sakuntala turned to follow her kinsmen. But her father's pupil who was like unto her father cried out "Halt there". Then she stayed and cast again her eyes, turbid with flowing tears, at my cruel person. Ah! that look ever haunts me and consumes me like a poisoned dart." Yes. he could not regain his peace of mind till he had wiped out the tears from those eyes. How charmingly does the Poet make Dushyanta say this *first*, when by chance he discovers her at the hermitage of Maricha. Sakuntala asks: "How chanced my lord to be put in mind of this unhappy one?" Dushyanta replies: उद्धृतविषादशल्यः कथयिष्यामि । "Let me first pluck from memory this rooted dart of sorrow."

And adds :—

मोहान्मया सुतनु पूर्वमुपेक्षितस्ते
यो बद्धबिन्दुरधरं परिबाधमानः ।
तं तावदाकुटिलपक्ष्मविलग्नमद्य
बाष्पं प्रमृज्य विगतानुशयो भवामि ॥

It is interesting to compare here Śhakespeare's delineation in his Winter's Tale of Leontes, the King of Sicily, when he recognises that he had unjustly cast away his wife Hermione. The King is so stricken with remorse—that a courtier says:—

"Sir, you have done enough and have performed a saint-like sorrow: no fault could you make which you have not redeemed: indeed, paid down, more penitence than done trespass: at the last, Do as the heavens have done, forget your evil: With them, forgive yourself."

The king then answers :—

"Whilst I remember
Her and her virtues, I cannot forget
My blemishes in them : and so still think of
The wrong I did myself : which was so much
That heirless it hath made my kingdom, and
Destroyed the sweetest companion that ever man
Bred his hopes out of."

The courtiers advise the king to marry again for getting an heir to the kingdom. The king is aghast at the idea which would so offend the lost Queen's memory. The Queen's lady friend who is present rubs this sore:

"Were I the ghost that walked, I would bid you mark
Her eye, and tell me for what dull part in it
You chose her: then I would shriek, that even your ears
Should rift to hear me:
And the words that followed
Should be, "Remember mine".

Kalidasa makes Sanumati, the friend of Sakuntala's mother, witness the king's extreme remorse which so gladdens her for the sake of her friend. अस्य सन्तापेन अहं रमे । In this scene, Kalidasa reaches the height of his artistry.

We see Dushyanta pouring out his heart, with the portrait of his lost beloved before him, when news is brought to him

of the death of a merchant prince without an heir : Oh, the poignancy of it! Time does not permit me to hold to your gaze these gems of art. The poet who dwells so much upon the sad plight of Dushyanta does not expatiate upon the similar state of Sakuntala. With admirable restraint, he just suggests it through the words of Sanumati.

स्थाने खलु प्रत्यादेशविमानिताप्यस्य कृते शकुन्तला क्लाम्यति ।

It is also noteworthy that Kalidasa does not send the deserted Sakuntala to Kanva's hermitage. How could he? You remember the earlier scene, when father and daughter so tearfully part. Sakuntala wistfully asks, "Father, when shall I see again this Ashram?". The father replies,

भूत्वा चिराय चतुरन्तमहीसपत्नी
दौष्यन्तिमप्रतिरथं तनयं निवेश्य ।
भर्त्रा तदर्पितकुटुम्बभरेण सार्धं
शान्ते करिष्यसि पदं पुनराश्रमेऽस्मिन् ॥

"My darling, you will assuredly come here with your husband in due time, after having reigned long with him as King and Queen and after your husband had thrown the burden of the land on your son, who would be without a peer." Can these words be belied?

We get a complete picture of the state of Sakuntala only when Dushyanta sees her at the hermitage of Maricha. The king exclaims—

वसने परिधूसरे वसाना नियमक्षाममुखी धृतैकवेणी ।
अतिनिष्करुणस्य शुद्धशीला मम दीर्घं विरहव्रतं वहन्ती ॥

The picture is that of a lady engaged in severe penance with matted lock and dusty garment. This ocular proof of Sakuntala's constancy should have gladdened the sorely tried heart of Dushyanta. You remember that when Hanuman sees Sita in the Asokavana, giving proof in her person of her unswerving loyalty to Rama, he exclaims that Rama should see her in that state.

इमां तु शीलसम्पन्नां द्रष्टुमर्हति राघवः ।

Alas, Rama did not have the good fortune that Dushyanta had! I wish to digress here a little. Hanuman had heard about the birth of Sita from the furrow. Perhaps it made no impression

on him at first. But as he saw the golden-hued Sita covered with dust and sitting on the earth, he could fancy her really rising ont of the ploughed field.

इयं सा धर्मशीलस्य मैथिलस्य महात्मनः ।
सुता जनकराजस्य सीता भर्तृदृढव्रता ॥
उत्थिता मेदिनीं भित्त्वा क्षेत्रे हलमुखक्षते ।
पद्मरेणुनिभैः कीर्णा शुभैः केदारपांसुभिः ॥

With rare skill, Valmiki has chosen this place to dwell upon the mysterious birth of Sita. Kamban, the Tamil Poet also describes this in very felicitous language:

உழுகின்ற கொழு முகத்தின் உதிக்கின்ற கதிரின் ஒளி
பொழிகின்ற புவிமடந்தை உருவெளிப்பட்டெனப் புணரி
எழுகின்ற தெள்ளமுதோடு எழுந்தவளும், இழிந்தொதுங்கித்
தொழுகின்ற நன்னலத்துப் பெண்ணரசி தோன்றினாள்.

But this description occurs only as a statement of fact in the Balakanda and does not have the marvellous propriety and significance of Valmiki's description. While on the subject of of beauty blossoming in the dust or rising out of the waves, let me recall this description by Charles Morgan of a fair woman entering a hall: "The darkly gleaming face of the oak chest in the hall was an instant surprised by her whiteness; A convex mirror acknowledged her, a plane of sunlight in the open door threw back her shadow as she advanced and then let her go".

Turning again to Dushyanta, sorrow has changed his appearance so much that at first Sakuntala fails to recognise him. Dushyanta feels that this is a just return for his failure to recognise her previously at court. He compares himself to one who failed to recognise an elephant when it stood before him; but on seeing its footsteps after it had passed away concludes that it should have been an elephant indeed. What a beautiful and apt simile!

I should like to refer here also to that passage where Dushyanta sees his own son at play and envies the lot of those that can fondle their children:—

आलक्ष्यदन्तमुकुलाननिमित्तहासै-
रव्यक्तवर्णरमणीयवचःप्रवृत्तीन् ।

अङ्काश्रयप्रणयिनस्तनयान्वहन्तो
धन्यास्तदङ्गरजसा मलिनीभवन्ति

Vedanta Desika also speaks of

आम्राविलेक्षणमनुक्षणमन्दहासम् गोपालडिम्भवपुषम् ।

Bhavabhuti puts similar sentiments in the mouth of Janaka as he laments over the fate of Sita and recalls her childhood.

अनियतरुदितस्मितं विराजत्कतिपयकोमलदन्तकुड्मलाग्रम् ।
वदनकमलकं शिशोः स्मरामि स्खलदसमञ्जसमञ्जु जल्पितं ते ॥

It is also remarkable how even a modern writer like John Galsworthy hits off the same idea in his Forsyte Saga:—

"Old Jolyon turned to the round little limbs, so reckless that they wanted care, to the small round face so indescribably solemn or bright, to the treble tongue and the shrill choking laughter, to the insistent tugging hands and the feel of a small body against his legs....." Of course, you will recall here the similar sentiments expressed by Tiruvalluvar.

1. குழலினிது யாழினிது என்பர்தம் மக்கள் |
மழலைச் சொற்கேளாதவர் ||
2. மக்கள் மெய்தீண்டல் உடற்கின்ப மற்றவர்
சொற் கேட்டலின்பம் செவிக்கு
3. அமிழ்தினு மாற்ற வினிதே தம்மக்கள்
சிறுகை யளாவிய கூழ் ||.

But the context in which Kalidasa has given expression to the charm that is in a child makes it something unique. The beauty of his last line remained unparalleled till Kulasekarazhwar sang his 'Devaki's lament':

தண்ணந்தாமரைக்கண்ணனே ! கண்ணே !
தவழ்ந்தெழுந்து தளர்ந்ததோர் நடையால்
மண்ணில் செம்பொடியாடிவந்து எந்தன்
மார்பில் மன்னிடப்பெற்றிலேன், அந்தோ !
வண்ணச்செஞ்சிறுகைவிரலனைத்தும்
வாரிவாய்க்கொண்ட அடிசிலின்மிச்சில்
உண்ணப்பெற்றிலேன் ஓ ! கொடுவினையேன்
என்னை என் செய்யப்பெற்றது, எம்மோயே !

I crave your indulgence to refer also in this connection to the extraordinary tenderness of Janaka to his daughter as suggested in the following passage of Bhavabuti;

हा वत्से,

नूनं त्वया परिभवं च वनं च घोरं
तां च व्यथां प्रसवकालकृतामवाप्य ।
क्रव्याद्गणेषु परितः परिवारयत्सु
संत्रस्तया शरणमित्यसकृत्स्मृतोऽस्मि ॥

"My child,

Disgraced, left alone in the jungle and surrounded by wild animals, when thou didst get the pangs of labour, then wouldst assuredly have called on *me* often and often for protection".

At times of great pain and danger, a woman would naturally cry "Amma". But Sita was a motherless child and she was not used to call on her "Amma". So the poet suggests so beautifully, that even in her labour pains, Sita would have cried "Appa".

One other point. A hermit lady sees Sakuntala's son and Dushyanta standing close and remarks on the resemblance in their features. Even then, the truth does not dawn on the cautious Dushyanta. As against this, we see in the Uttara Rama Charita, Rama himself tracing the features of his beloved on the faces of Lava and Kusa. "Beautiful through the clear white colour of the teeth, the formation of the lips is the same as Janaki's. The curve of the ear is the same. The eyes are no doubt reddish blue, but the attractiveness is the same".

शुक्लाच्छदन्तच्छविसुन्दरेयं
सैवोष्ठमुद्रा स च कर्णपाशः ।
नेत्रे पुनर्यद्यपि रक्तनीले
तथापि सौभाग्यगुणः स एव ॥

Both Kalidasa's Sakuntalam and Bhavabuti's Uttara Rama Charita are marvellous creations. In keeping with his message of austere union, Kalidasa preserves throughout a sense of restraint, dignity and suggestiveness with an undercurrent of tenderness. Bhavabhuti on the other hand makes the Karuna rasa his dominant motif, and is therefore more effusive. It would pay us to compare and contrast these two Mahakavis

with one another and with other great poets of the world, but I have no leave now to try your patience further. I conclude with Kalidasa's prayer—

> प्रवर्ततां प्रकृतिहिताय पार्थिवः
> सरस्वती श्रुतमहतां महीयताम् ॥

Possibly, this was the prayer recited by Sir S. Radhakrishnan the other day at Moscow. Any way, it is in effect the same as the following traditional prayer:—

> स्वस्ति प्रजाभ्यः परिपालयन्तां
> न्याय्येन मार्गेण महीं महीशाः ।
> गोब्राह्मणेभ्यः शुभमस्तु नित्यं
> लोकाः समस्ताः सुखिनो भवन्तु ॥

# THE DATE OF THE YOGAVĀSIṢṬHA[1]

BY

DR. V. RAGHAVAN

Contrary to the views of scholars like Haraprasad Sastri, Winternitz, Sivaprasad Bhattacharya and P. C. Diwanji, Dr. B. L. Atreya held in his Thesis " The Philosophy of Yogavasistha ", (1936), that the Yogāvasiṣṭha was a pre-Śaṅkara work; placing it between Kālidāsa and Bhartṛhari, he contended that it had influenced Gauḍapāda, Bhartṛhari, Śaṅkara and Sureśvara. In the *Journal of Oriental Research*, Madras, (April-June 1936, XIII, ii, pp. 100-128), I re-opened the question of the date of the Yogavāsiṣṭha and showed, after a detailed examination of the text, that the work available in the Nirnaya Sagara Edition in two volumes, which formed the basis of Dr. Atreya's study also, was to be placed between the 11th and the middle of the 13th centuries.

Swami Bhumanand of Kalipur Asram, Assam, sent me a reply (the substance of which I got published in the *Journal of Oriental Research*, Madras, XIII, iv, pp. 345-6) in which he tried to support Dr. Atreya's pre-Śaṅkara theory; the full paper of the Swamiji was submitted to the Tirupathi Session of this Conference, 1940, and separately printed and circulated with Dr. Atreya's Foreword. Recently the Swamiji presented a similar paper on the priority of the Yogavāsiṣṭha to Śaṅkara to the Darbhanga Session of the Conference; this, printed along with the previous paper, has also been circulated.

In this paper of mine I propose to examine the evidences cited by the Swamiji in support of the pre-Śaṅkara theory; this reply, I feel, is necessary, as the Swamiji has reverted to the subject.

On p. 3 of his latest pamphlet, the Swamiji says, in the first paper, that the language, mode of composition and style of the Yogavāsiṣṭha would convince the reader of its priority to Śaṅkara. I invite the Swamiji's attention to some evidence in this line that I have adduced in foot-notes (*d*) and (*e*) on p. 123 of my article in the *Journal of Oriental Research*, Madras, which clearly points to a post-Śaṅkara date.

---

1. Paper submitted to the Religion and Philosophy Section of the 15th Session of the All-India Oriental Conference, Bombay.

The Swamiji then says [point (*b*) on p. 4] that while Śaṅkara's terminology has been used by all post-Śaṅkara writers, the Yogavāsiṣṭha does not use it anywhere. On this point, I invite the Swamiji's attention to the ideas and expressions of Śaṅkara found in the Yogavāsiṣṭha that I have set forth on pp. 118-121 of my above-mentioned article.

The argument of alleged difference of approach and emphasis between Śaṅkara and Yogavāsiṣṭha that Dr. Atreya speaks of in his thesis and the Swamiji re-iterates in his article (pp. 4—6) has been met by me in the same article referred to above. Even if this difference is real or substantial, it would hardly be evidence for chronology.

Then comes the main argument of the Swamiji that Śaṅkara's works, major and minor, quote from and refer to the Yogavāsiṣṭha. A number of parallel passages between the Yogavāsiṣṭha and the minor works of Śaṅkara were pointed out by Dr. Atreya; I pointed out more. The Swamiji adds some more. While Atreya and the Swamiji hold that Śaṅkara is the borrower, I hold that the Yogavāsiṣṭha is the borrower. Before we go to that question, let us see the quotations and the parallels collected by the Swamiji, particularly the additional ones he has given in his more recent paper.

On pp. 17-19, the Swamiji cites seven passages from the Yogavāsiṣṭha as being echoed or reproduced in a minor work of Śaṅkarācārya, the Prabodhasudhākara. I have pointed out in the *Adyar Library Bulletin*, Vol. I, Pt. 1, Mss. Notes pp. 43-44, and it is also well-known, that the Prabodhasudhākara, wrongly printed among the minor works of Śaṅkara, is a work of the astronomer-poet Daivajña Sūrya Paṇḍita; not only many manuscripts proclaim this, but Sūrya Paṇḍita himself expressly mentions it as a work of his in his Sūryaprakāśa Bījavyākhyā (India Office Ms. 2823) and his Līlāvatīvyākhyā, the Gaṇitāmṛtakūpikā.

Regarding parallels found in other works of Śaṅkara, minor or major, the question of the mutual chronology between the Yogavāsiṣṭha and Śaṅkara can be settled only by other evidence; in this regard, I have shown in my paper how the Yogavāsiṣṭha has many indisputable borrowings from such writers like Ānandavardhana, Rājaśekhara and Abhinanda, author of the Rāmacarita, all of which would establish the post-Śaṅkara date of the Yogavāsiṣṭha. One cannot shut his

eyes to sixteen passages of whole verses and parts thereof belonging to the last mentioned source, the Rāmacarita of Abhinanda, *c.* 900 A. D., incorporated into Yogavāsiṣṭha, VI-a. 128. The Swamiji has evidently not seen my article in full. It is therefore the Yogavāsiṣṭha which incorporates within itself whole passages and texts of so many writers that has borrowed from Śaṅkara.

Three evidences adduced by the Swamiji which I have left over for consideration at the end are of a different kind, as they are held to be direct and express references in Śaṅkara's works to Vasiṣṭha and his Yogavāsiṣṭha. First, in explaining Gītā XIII. 4 ऋषिभिर्बहुधा गीतम्, Śaṅkara in his Bhāṣya says, ऋषिभिः वसिष्ठादिभिः. The Swamiji says "This is undoubtedly a reference to Yogavāsiṣṭha, as there is no other philosophical work of Vasiṣṭha." Now, a reading of the Bhāṣya on the whole verse Gītā XIII. 4 would show that to Śaṅkara, who explains the word Brahma-sūtra-pada here as the words of the Upaniṣads which indicate the Brahman, Brahma-sūcaka, the very idea of taking the verse as referring to any works like the Yogavāsiṣṭha or the Brahma-Sūtras of Bādarāyaṇa is repugnant. All that Śaṅkara would have meant by Vasiṣṭha here is to give the name of a renowned Vedic Ṛṣi.

Second, there are a few verses quoted from a Vāsiṣṭha Yoga Śāstra in the commentary on the Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad ascribed to Śaṅkara under Mantra 8, ch. 1. Whether these verses occur in the Yogavāsiṣṭha and where have not been pointed out. As the Swamiji himself has noted in his first paper, scholars do not accept the Śvetāśvatara Bhāṣya as a genuine work of Ādi Śaṅkara. The prolix manner in which quotations are made and names like Gauḍapāda are mentioned here is quite unlike that of Śaṅkara.[1] To prove a contentious problem, evidence from a controversial quarter is to be avoided.

Third, the Swamiji makes a reference to two citations under the heading तथा चाह भगवान् वसिष्ठः and तथा चाह वसिष्ठः found in the Bhāṣya on the Sanat-sujātīya (Ch. I, verses 15, 31). The second of these is a

1. See also Ashutosh Mukherji Silver Jubilee Vol. III, Orientalia, pt. 2, pp. 102-3, Vidhusekhara Bhattacharya on Śaṅkara's commentaries on the Upaniṣads.

quotation from the Vasiṣṭha *Smṛti,* same as the quotation from Vasiṣṭha's Smṛti in Śaṅkara's Brahma Sūtra Bhāṣya, 3. iv. 50 without the third line and the additional prose bit at the end. Regarding the first, it is very difficult to say anything. The Swamiji has not shown where it occurs in the Yogavāsiṣṭha. It may be, like the latter quotation, from the Vasiṣṭha Smṛti. Unfortunately the text of the Vasiṣṭha Smṛti is not in a fixed form; of the two verses and the prose bit quoted from it by Śaṅkara under Brahma Sūtra, 3. iv. 50, the first verse and the prose bit are found in the available editions of the Vasiṣṭha Smṛti, M. N. Dutt's Dharma Sastra Texts Vol. I, Ānandāśrama 48, and Dr. Rev. A. A. Führer's edition in the Bombay D. P. I. Publications; in the Sanatsujātīya Bhāṣya, I. 31, this Vasiṣṭha Smṛti quotation occurs without the first line of the second verse, and Führer notes at the end of his edition some Vāsiṣṭha quotations not found in the manuscripts of the Smṛti.

Even if this verse cited as of Bhagavān Vasiṣṭha is not in some version of the Vasiṣṭha Smṛti and is to be traced to the Yogavāsiṣṭha, this would prove the priority of the Yogavāsiṣṭha to Śaṅkara, only if the Sanatsujātīya Bhāṣya is accepted by scholars as a genuine work of Ādi Śaṅkara. The Sanatsujātīya bhāṣya, *pace* the reference in the Mādhavīya Śaṅkaravijaya cited by the Swamiji, sails however on the same boat as the Svetāśvataropaniṣadbhāṣya; the nature of the quotations and the references in it, which include two from a work called the Nāmamahodadhi (I. 16, and II. 16) would indicate an author different from and later than Ādi Śaṅkara.

# A NOTE ON NĀSATYAU AND DASRAU

BY

SRI K. BALASUBRAHMANYA IYER

In a brief article on the semantic history of the words Nāsatyau and Dasrau, in the *Journal of Oriental Research*, Madras, Vol. 15, pp. 18-20, Dr. P. S. Subrahmanya Sastri, formerly Head of the Department of Sanskrit, Annamalai University, discusses the change of connotation of the words 'Nāsatyau' and 'Dasrau', at the present time from what it was during the time of the author of the Anukramaṇī. Then, the word 'Nāsatya' was the name of one of the Aśvinī devatās and 'Dasra' the name of the other. In this connection, it is interesting to note the sense in which the words 'Nāsatya' and 'Dasra' have been used in the Śrīmad Bhāgavata. In the Śrīmad Bhāgavata. II. ii., we find a description of the Viśvarūpa Upāsanā of the Lord. The Upāsaka is directed to meditate upon the whole Universe as the body of the Lord. The many devatās like the Sun, Moon etc., are said to represent the various limbs and parts of the human body. It is said here in verse 29 that the two Aśvinī devatās represent the two cavities of the nose. One of the two Aśvinī devatās is said to be Nāsatya and the other Dasra. It is very clear from the mention of the words 'Nāsatya' and 'Dasra' in this connection that the author of the Śrīmad Bhāgavata has in mind the original connotation of the two words representing each of the pair known as the Aśvinī Devatās. Śrīmad Bhāgavata adopts the vedic connotations of words and gives a preference to them in the use of words in classic Sanskrit. This we find as the characteristic of the Bhāgavata in many places. Hence this reference from Bhāgavata is valuable as supporting the point mentioned by Dr. P. S. Subrahmanya Sastri in his article.

इन्द्रादयो बाहव आहुरुस्राः कर्णौ दिशः श्रोत्रममुष्य शब्दः ।
नासत्यदस्रौ परमस्य नासे घ्राणोऽस्य गन्धो मुखमग्निरिद्धः ॥

Śrīmad Bhāgavata, II-2-29.

In the description of the Lord's Viswarupa, the Vishnu Purana also mentions in I. v. 57 the two names 'Nasatya' and 'Dasra' separately for the two Aśvinī Devatās.

एते वयं वृत्ररिपुस्तथायम् नासत्यदस्रौ वरुणस्तथैव ।

# MONKEYS AND SERPENTS IN THE EPICS

BY

T. R. VENKATARAMA SASTRI

I have often wondered, as many another student of our great epics, the *Ramayana* and the *Mahabharata*, must have done, whether the monkeys in the Ramayana and the Nagas or Serpents or Uragas or Pannagas in both epics were mere animals or a people whom their indubitably human accociates treated as men of inferior civilization, as lesser breeds without the law, who had or were given animal names but who were not incapable of social commerce with human beings. A friend well-read in the epics with a well-cultivated historical sense tells me that it is a futile question, that there were never any tailed beings or reptiles with power of speech and kamarupis, capable at will of taking the shape of human beings, that they were only the creations of the poet's imagination. They were represented at once as less and more than human. If that view is right *cadit quaestio*. But that view goes a great way to dismiss the war against Rāvaṇa as mythical. The *sakhya* with Sugriva is so essential to the recovery of Sita, that a Sarga is devoted to रामः त्वां शरणं गतः addressed to Sugriva, though Rama had previously dealt single-handed with *Khara's* fourteen thousand. I have, however, the feeling which I advance, not without diffidence, that they were human beings whose help Rama and Lakshmana begged for and got but whom notwithstanding great affection and intimacy, they treated or regarded as inferior breeds of men.

To take the Rāmāyana first. In Balakanda, sarga 17, the gods are asked to create beings to assist Vishnu when he comes down as Rāma, in his war with Rāvana. सृजध्वं कामरूपिणः. sṛjadhvam kamarupiṇah. Brahma had already created Jāmbavān. Now Indra begets Vāli; Sūrya Sugrīva, Vāyu Hanumān, etc., to name only three prominent ones. Bṛhaspati, Varuna and the Asvins beget other monkeys. The word *kāmarupinah* at once removes them from the category of mere animals. Besides, they speak a language and some of them are deemed very learned. They have a kingdom with a king, who has a wise wife and a son and a brother, with whose wife he is charged

with living in adultery. That is Rama's apparent justification for killing him, though he adds a contradictory justification that he is a mere animal not entitled to the privileges of civilized warfare. They could be hunted as animals and killing Vali from a covert is not reprehensible. If then he is taken as an animal literally, what becomes of the statements that he has a wife and a son and brother and that he is living in adultery. Neither adultery nor incest can be charged against animals and both charges are levelled against Vāli.

When Kabandha recommends an alliance with Sugrīva as the only means of recovering Sītā, he describes Sugrīva as Ātmavān, Vinīta, Dhṛtimān, Matimān etc., qualities inapplicable to mere animals.

When later Hanumān meets the brothers *as the sachiva or minister* of Sugriva, Rama expresses his admiration of the monkey by saying that there was not one *apaśabda* in the course of a long conversation and that he must therefore be well-versed in the Ṛgveda and Yajurveda and also in Saṃskrit grammar. By the way it should be added that Hanumān is said to be the predestined successor of Brahma for the next Kalpa.

Vāli is said to be performing his *sandhyā* devotions when Ravana, with his insatiable thirst to offer fight to every powerful warrior or potentate of the three worlds, sought to seize him from behind. What sort of *sandhyā* devotion a monkey can perform I cannot conceive. When he dies, obsequial rites are performed. Who has heard of obsequies for a dead animal ?. So for about Kapis.

*As to Nagas.* Naga-Kanyakās are said to have been carried away by Ravana and all that they do is to bemoan their fate and set up loud wails and though *kāmarupiṇīs* they make no attempt to escape in their true Nāga shape as Takshaka did when Uttanka pursued him. These are mentioned along withYakshas and Gandharvas and Rakshasas in the same compound words, suggesting that they belong to the same category of beings. There is reference to Yakshas, Kinnaras and Kimpurushas and Gandharvas as in part divine.

Now, turning to the Mahābhārata, things are even clearer. There are no Kapis in the Mahabharata except for Hanumān who meets Bhīma in the Vanaparva. Māhābhārata deals with the north while Ramayana primarily deals with

South India. Janamejaya accepts a Sarpi's son Somasravas as a *purohita*. The great Astīka was the son of a Sarpa princess, sister of Vasuki. Arjuna married a Nagi and had a son by her. The sons of Naga women could rank as high-class Brahmins as were Janamejaya's purohita, Somasravas, and Astīka. They could be great warriors like Arjuna's son, Irāvān. Those were days when the father probably determined the function of the son and *Bījād yonir garīyasī* (बजाद्योनिर्गरीयसी) had not yet become the established doctrine. Somasravas, Astīka and Irāvan cannot be dismissed from the cetegory of human beings.

Incidentally I may comment here on a recent suggestion that Śrutásravas was one and the same person as Jaratkāru and that Astīka was the same as Somasravas and he was chosen as purohita by Janamejaya for curing his brothers of the dogbite which the curse of devasuni is conceived to be. To me it appears to be a misunderstanding of the opening chapters of the Mahabharata. All the episodes narrated, seemingly irrelevant and rambling, have a bearing on the Sarpa-Sattra and are narrated as preliminary to the recital of the Mahabharata by Vaisampayana at the Sattra.

The long episode of Uttanka is to start in the mind of Janamejaya the idea of a Sarpa sacrifice, and four other episodes are to lead to the unfinished close of the Sarpa Sattra namely

The curse of Devasuni that an unexpected impediment will overtake their enterprise, which vexed Janamejaya is the first. The acceptance as purohita of Sarpi's son, with presumable Sarpa sympathies, and in addition with an *upāmśu vrata* which compelled in advance the granting of Astīka's request for the boon is the second. The pre-destined birth of Astīka to save his uncle's tribe from extinction as the result of Kadru's curse is the third. The prognostication of the mason who constructed the vedi for the Sattra that the Sattra would end unfinished is the fourth.

I may also notice the controversy over the point whether the Sarpa Sattra was a sacrificial ceremony or really a holocaust of human victims by a conqueror. I consider it a holocaust of enemy victims. I will ask those who take an opposite view to consider the following points :—

1. Is the conquest of Takshasila referred to in I. 3. 20. Mahabharata, an event with no connection with the Sarpa-Sattra story? What is its relevancy?

2. Why was the Sattra performed in Takshsila and not in Hastinapura where the Mantras, if they are sacred hymns, having a magically compelling effect on the victims, will have been as efficacious as at Takshasila?

3. Indra is one of the gods to be propitiated at a sacrifice but at this Sattra he was threatened with the same fate as the Ñagas if he persisted in protecting Takshaka, and lastly,

4. The history of Takshaka—Arjuna feud in the Mahabharata as narrated below.

Takshaka was originally living with his family in the Khandava forest. During the absence of Takshaka, Arjuna set fire to the forest and killed Takshaka's wife, and his son barely made his escape with the help of Indra. Presumably Takshaka killed Arjuna's grandson and successor to the Pandavas and bribed off Kasyapa who could have revived the king. Parikshit's son and successor conquers Takshasila and attempts to kill all his serpent enemies. I do not say Takshaka founded Takashasila; but he lived on the banks of the *Vipaśa* nearby according to the Vanaparva. It is a continuous feud between Takshaka and Arjuna's family. It is surprising that Indra, who is the reputed father of Arjuna, is on the side of Takshaka in the *Khāṇḍavadahana* and in the Sarpa Sattra.

I have a faint recollection of having heard Dr. Rabindra Nath Tagore say that in the Sarpa Sattra story lay concealed a tragic event in the early history of India.

Now, to return to our original question, there are only three views possible :—

(1) that these are animals,
(2) that they are groups of men, or
(3) that they are only creatures of the poet's imagination—invested with animal natures but having extra-ordinary powers.

The first view can be dismissed at once because these beings speak a language or languages and are credited with all the indicia of human beings and are held morally responsible for their conduct.

The second is what I believe to be correct and submit for consideration.

The third is only epic exaggeration. It may seem blasphemous, but it seems to me epic exaggeration to say that Rama seized the corpse of Dundubhi with his toes and threw it ten Yojanas, that he pierced seven sāḷa trees with an arrow aimed at them and that Hanuman brought away the top of a hill in order to make the unknown herbs available for Rama and Lakshmana. That they were exceptionally strong is intended to be conveyed but that these feats were performed is only the poet's way of saying that Sugriva was greatly impressed with his prowess.

I may add that in the Tandya Brahmana I came upon a reference to Sarpa Sattra but it happens to be a Sattra by the Sarpas as Yajamānas with Dhṛtarashtra Airāvata as Brahma, Takshaka Vaiśāleya as Brāhmaṇācchamsi and Janamejaya Ārbuda as Grāvastut. Obviously they are all Nagas performing Sattra as Yajamānas. What light it throws on a Sattra in which the serpents were victims, I cannot say. But one would infer that as Yajamānas in a Sattra they must be men making the same sacrifice as the Aryans with the same Ṛtviks. But the same passage refers to the casting off sloughs by serpents indicating that it is perhaps an *arthavāda* in praise of the Sattra.

Sayana's introduction is "Atha pratishthā-sādhanam sarpanām Sattram āha"

The performance is thus praised—

> etena vai sarpā eshu lokeshu pratyatishthan;
> eteshu lokeshu pratitishṭhanti
> ya etad upayanti.

but even this passage refers to their character as reptiles by referring to their casting of sloughs like serpents.

> etena sarpā apamṛtyum ajayan; apamṛtyum
> jayanti ya etad upayanti. Tasmat te
> hitva tvacam . . . . .

Janamejaya Parikshita is also referred to as a king who has his capital as Āsandīvant and whose Aśvamedha was performed by Indrota Daivāpi or Tura Kāvasheya, as differently stated in Aitareya and in Śatapatha Brahmaṇas.

I may also refer to Sarpas as devatās of Āślesha and to the well-known fact that Ananta was a close associate of Vishnu even as Lakshmana was of Rama.

Now, I should like to hear what view others take and why.

## THE KUPPUSWAMI SASTRI RESEARCH INSTITUTE

A meeting of the Kuppuswami Sastri Research Institute was held on Monday the 19th December, 1949, at the premises of the Institute, Sri Chandrasekharendra Sarasvati Mandapa, Sanskrit College, Mylapore, Madras, when Prof. D. S. Sarma read a paper on "The Background of the Lalitasahasranama".

Sri Swami Kailasanandaji, President, Ramakrishna Mission, Madras, presided.

Prof. Sarma dealt with the Devi cult and the place occupied by the Lalitasahasranama in its literature and gave an appreciation of the work from the historical, devotional and literary points of view.

Citing the experience of Sri Ramakrishna Paramahamsa, the President pointed out the significance and special appeal of Mother-worship.

## BOOK REVIEWS

New Catalogus Catalogorum. An Alphabetical Register of Sanskrit and Allied Works and Authors. Dr. V. Raghavan, Madras University, Vol. I. A-अ. 1949; p. xxxvi + 380 in 4 (Madras Univers. Ser. no. 18). Rs. 25.

Here at last is the beginning of that long looked-for undertaking, long since promised. Aufrecht's work, which is the basis of the present work, was brought out some fifty years ago; it is now outdated by the ever growing number of new discoveries. These discoveries have added to the identifiable authors and texts, and increased tenfold the available manuscripts; at the same time it has facilitated in innumerable instances the fixing of precise dates and the correct attribution of references, as well as authenticating the texts.

Begun in 1935, under the direction of Prof. S. Kuppuswamy Sastri and then of Prof. Kunhan Raja in 1938, it is V. Raghavan, working without a premanent assistant, who is entirely responsible for the work. To bring home the way in which this has slowed down the work, it is only necessary to observe the date of the present volume, which comprises only titles beginning with the letter A and which was ready to go to press in 1943. The delay in publication, for which the war and its consequences were largely responsible, made it necessary to add 22 full pages; it is to be hoped that these additions will appear in another volume, together with even further discoveries, which research and ever increasing sources of information must surely and steadily bring to light.

Thus, compared to Aufrecht's, this work bears witness to the considerable increase in production (some 12,000 titles here are equivalent to the 2,000 titles of works and authors, including commentaries, in the earlier work). It is of course true that Dr. Raghavan had the happy inspiration of adding the Buddhist and Jaina literature, which had been omitted by his predecessor. On the other hand he has planned his work on a much larger scale, indexing, author by author, the information necessary to date and identify them, and to assist in proving or disproving the authenticity of their works. In the considerable and erudite literary produc-

tion we owe to Dr. Raghavan, a certain number of articles are known to be devoted to this type of problem; the Poona indianist, P. K. Gode, was zealous himself in this very domain. It is one of the necessary tasks of the literary indology, though hardly practised in Europe, to obtain in this province an exactitude and precision, which frequently result in new developments, or corrections. In consulting this catalogue it will be noticed that, for certain well known authors as well as for the more obscure, Dr. Raghavan gives extremely full information, the matter being condensed into short monographs. Amongst well known authors may be cited Anubhūtisvarūpa, Annaṃbhaṭṭa, Appayadīkṣita (whose work is carefully distinguished from some fifteen authors bearing the same name, besides Appaya, Appayācārya, Appayārya, etc.); of the less well known the following may be mentioned, Aghoraśivācārya, Abhinanda, Ammālārya, Aṇṇāśāstrin, Agastyapaṇḍita, Anantadeva. In other cases, on the contrary, as for Aśvaghoṣa, the bibliography given is incomplete, but the "Bibliographie Bouddhique" will easily afford means to fill the gaps. This informatton is so useful, though it will, to some extent, check the progress of the Catalogus, whose inventory part itself is sufficiciently overwhelming: 400 catalogues or lists were consulted (against 76 in Aufrecht's book). This does not take into account the special studies and particular descriptions of various manuscripts, etc.

Its rapid, or at least more rapid completion, is of great importance to Indianists. The Univerisity of Madras should give Dr. Raghavan the means to enable him to work: namely, devoted and competent assistants, and the sending of missions to various parts of the territory, in which a hitherto unknown collection is reported. At the same time as this compilation is proceeding, measures should be taken without delay for the preservation of manuscripts, by the provincial authorities, not to mention the Central Government. Deterioration, loss, and the gathering in anonymous collections, are risks which compromise the survival of literary treasure.

It is obvious that Dr. Raghavan cannot continue this gigantic work alone. It seems to me that the great Madras University, which has done so much in the past for Sanskrit studies, should hasten the completion of this magnum opus by assuring satisfactory conditions.

LOUIS RENOU.

THE ESSENTIALS OF INDIAN PHILOSOPHY by Prof. M. Hiriyanna, M.A. George Allen & Unwin Ltd., London, 1949. 12 *s*. 6 *d*.

Advanced students of Indian Philosophy, particularly of Indian darśanas, owe a deep debt of gratitude to Prof. M. Hiriyanna of Mysore, for his valuable work "Outlines of Indian Philosophy", which contains a critical study of the orthodox and heterodox systems of Indian Philosophy. The book under review is an abridgement of this larger work and aims to give a simpler and shorter account of the subject, chiefly for the purpose of the general reader.

The book is in eight chapters. Chapter I deals with Vedic religion and philosophy which is mainly based on the three sections of the Vedas viz., the karmakāṇḍa, the upāsanākāṇḍa and the jñānakāṇḍa, all of which belong to pre-Buddhistic age. It also contains a study of three main currents of thought in the Vedic hymns, monotheism, monism and ritualism; and the philosophy of the Upaniṣads representing the culmination in the monistic and absolutistic philosophy.

Chapter II treats of the transition to the systems as based on the Upaniṣads, the Epics and a few Purāṇas and Āgamas. It traces the origin of Śaivism and Vaiṣṇavism on the basis of the conception of the Trinity of Gods (Brahma, the creator, Viṣṇu, the preserver, and Śiva, the destroyer), as well as the development of the six non-Vedic heterodox systems—nāsitka-darśanas—and the six orthodox systems—āstika-darśanas. It also gives a vivid account of the points of agreement and disagreement among the systems as chiefly lying in their conceptions of the nature and number of pramāṇas and the nature of knowledge. Most of the systems explain the karma doctrine which has tremendous influence on the life of the Indians. The theory of transmigration is a necessary corollary to the doctrine of karma.

Chapter III briefly deals with the non-Vedic schools—Materialism (of the Cārvākas), Jainism and Buddhism. The svabhāvavāda is spoken to be the chief doctrine of the Cārvāka system. It admits of only one pramāṇa, namely pratyakṣa. It does not believe in any spiritual value; nor does it accept the existence of an eternal soul different from the body which is described as a unique combination of the four elements

earth, water, fire and air. Jainism distinguishes Jīva from ajīva, the animate from the inanimate and recognises the individual self as an eternal substance though it is capable of adjusting its size to the body in which it happens to be housed. Knowledge is its very essence. It believes in transmigration and the doctrine of karma. It also believes in the practice of severe asceticism like that of non-violence (ahiṁsā). The goal of life is to restore the soul to its pristine purity when it attains omniscience, infinite knowledge, infinite peace and power. Right faith, right knowledge and right conduct are the 'three jewels'—tri-ratna. 'Pristine Buddhism represents a new explanation, not against but within Brahminism'. 'Buddha's teaching was a protest against ritualism that in one sense had given rise to the Upaniṣadic doctrine itself.' Just as the Upaniṣads lay down a course of discipline by Yoga for the self becoming Brahman, Buddha also emphasizes the practice of dharma which signifies perfect conduct or godly living. In this connection the author gives a brief survey of the chief teaching of the Pali Buddhistic literature, namely the Four noble Truths, which formed the subject matter of the very first sermon of Buddha delivered at Benares. The four Truths are: (1) Life is evil, (2) Ignorance is the source of evil, (3) Evil can be overcome, and, (4) Right knowledge is the means of removing evil. Then the growth of Buddhism into two schools, Hīnayāna and Mahāyāna, in later years not only in India but in other countries like China and Japan with their doctrinal agreements and disagreements is vividly described.

Chapter IV deals with the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika systems which accept Vedic authority on supernormal values like dharma and mokṣa. They are realistic in the sense that they believe in the existence and reality of the external world. As regards the nature of ultimate reality, they maintain that they are many and so they are known as pluralistic in contrast with the monistic doctrines. The pluralistic view is described under two main heads—nature and spirit. Nature comprises matter, time and space; matter again, is subdivided into five elements, earth, water, fire, air and ether; the spirit is divided into self (ātman) and mind. They are called ārambha-vādins and asatkārya-vādins in that they believe that effect is a new entity and is newly produced by its causes, atoms and others. The cosmological scheme that these systems postulate necessitate the acceptance of God—paramātman—as the all-knowing being

who being the efficient cause disposes the atoms in the manner required for the emergence of this phenomenal world. In this connection the author gives a short but vivid account of the other categories—quality, action, generality, particularity (viśeṣa), eternal relation (samavāya) and non-existence. The Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika systems accept the nature of the goal of life as absolute freedom from worldly misery. When the self becomes subject to both pain and pleasure it has samsāra and when it is completely relieved of it is liberated finally. The negative aspect of liberation together with the ultimate means to achieve it is discussed by our author in a separate section.

Chapter V gives an account of the Sāṅkhya-Yoga systems which accept both matter and spirit as ultimately real and the plurality of selves. The Sāṅkhya system traces the whole of physical world to a single source, Prakṛti. It believes in the theory of evolution—pariṇāmavāda and satkāryavāda—that the effect ever exists in its cause and it is only a transformation of its cause. The Prakṛti is a composite form of three guṇas, sattva, rajas and tamas, which are in a state of equilibrium in Prakṛti until it begins to differentiate itself; and the diversity of the things that successively spring into being form it is due to the diversity in the proportion in which the guṇas enter into their make-up in the process of evolution. From Prakṛti emerges intellect, which gives rise to egoism—ahaṁkāra. From egoism emerge two groups of principles, one with aids to conscious life—manas, the five sensory organs and the five organs of action; while the other forming the basis of the objective world, the five subtle and gross elements. The Sāṅkhya-Yoga systems admit three pramāṇas—perception, inference and verbal testimony including the Vedas. Its conception of liberation is kaivalya—aloofness or escape from prakṛti. Its means is self-discipline through self-detachment by the practice of Yoga. The Sāṅkhya system does not believe in the existence of God, the supreme force while the Yoga system accepts Him. The Yoga system concentrates on the details of self-discipline which are detailed by our author.

Chapter VI treats of Pūrvamimāṁsā, a system investigating dharma as explained mainly by the karmakāṇḍa of the Vedas. It is pluralistic and realistic and accepts only five categories—substance, quality, action, generality and non-existence (according to Kumārila). Under substance, dark-

ness and sound are added to the well known nine. It accepts 24 qualities (according to Kumārila) with dhvani, prākaṭya and śakti replacing śabda, dharma and adharma. It postulates six pramāṇas (according to Kumārila) adding arthāpatti and anupalabdhi to the well-known four. The doctrine of self-validity of knowledge, the inferableness through jñātatā, its peculiarity to have the self as the knower and the known are a few topics which our author has very clearly elucidated. The conception of ātman, of dharma and adharma and of mokṣa according to Kumārila and Prabhākara has been treated in a separate section.

Chapters VII and VIII deal with Vedānta both absolutistic and theistic. They give a brief account of the monistic philosophy of Śrī Śaṅkara based on Upaniṣads, Gītā and the Brahmasūtras with the later developed doctrines of vivarta-vāda and parināma-vāda. The doctrine of māyā, the conception of Brahman as ultimate reality and the doctrine of oneness of jīva and Brahman and the ultimate release of Individual self from bondages are vividly portrayed by our author. So also the theistic philosophy advocated by Śrī Rāmānuja and Śrī Ānandatīrtha have been separately treated in a chapter, though in his larger work the author has not dealt with Ānandatīrtha's dualistic philosophy.

The book is bound to be a valuable guide to both students and teachers of Indian philosophy. It is written in a simple, clear and unambiguous language and as far as possible, based on the original texts in Sanskrit and Pāli languages. The learned Professor has taken pains to give notes and references and a glossory which are very valuable and add to the value of the work as a reference book.

V. A. Ramaswami Sastri.

# TOLKĀPPIYAM

## *Section III-Poruḷ-atikāram*

### களவியல்

### (*iii*) *Kaḷaviyal*

(The chapter on the mutual consent of the lover and the lady-love to marry without the knowledge of the lady's parents.)

89. இன்பமும் பொருளு மறனு மென்றாங்கு
அன்பொடு புணர்ந்த வைந்திணை மருங்கின்
காமக் கூட்டங் காணுங் காலை
மறையோர் தேஎத்து மன்ற லெட்டனுள்
துறையமை நல்யாழ்த் துணைமையோ ரியல்பே.

*Iṉpamum poruḷu m-aṟaṉu m-eṉṟāṅkū*
*Aṉpoṭu puṇarnta v-aintiṇai maruṅkiṉ*
*Kāma-k kūṭṭaṅ kāṇuṅ kālai*
*Maṟaiyōr tēettu maṉṟa l-eṭṭaṉuḷ*
*Tuṟaiyamai nal-yāḻt tuṇaimaiyō r-iyalpē.*

*Kaḷavu* or *kāmakkūṭṭam*—which falls within the range of the five *tiṇais* connected with reciprocal love and which is the source of pleasure, worldly objects and dharma is, on examination, of the type of the *gāndharva* marriage among the eight kinds of marriage mentioned in the Vēdas.

Note 1.—The eight kinds of marriage are:—*brāhma*, *prājāpa'ya*, *ārṣa*, *dāiva*, *āsura*, *gāndharva*, *rākṣasa* and *pāiśāca*. In the first five, the father of the bride gives her away to the bridegroom. In the *gāndharva*, the mutual consent of the lover and the lady-love is the deciding factor. This system is sure to exist where girls remain unmarried after puberty. The *svayamvara* also forms a type of *gāndharva*. But such a one does not get the name of *kaḷavu* in Tamil Literature. Hence *kaḷavu* is the mutual consent of the lover and the lady-love to marry without the knowledge of the lady's parents.

Note 2.—*Maṟai* and *maṟaiyōr-tēem* convey the same meaning.

Note 3.—The first line, according to *Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar*, means "among *iṉpam*, *poruḷ* and *aṟaṉ*."

Between whom does *kaḷavu* happen?

90. ஒன்றே வேறே யென்றிரு பால்வயின்
ஒன்றி யுயர்ந்த பால தாணையின்
ஒத்த கிழவனுங் கிழத்தியுங் காண்ப
மிக்கோ னாயினுங் கடிவரை யின்றே.

*Oṉṟē vēṟē y-eṉṟiru pālvayiṉ*
*Oṉṟi y-uyarnta pāl-a t-āṇaiyiṉ*
*Otta kiḻavaṉ-uṅ kiḻatti-y-uṅ kāṇpa*
*Mikkō ṉ-āyiṉuṅ kaṭi-varai y-iṉṟ-ē.*

Suitable lover and lady-love belonging to the same region or of different regions come within the view of each other through the direction of the Fate which gradually raises them by making them husband and wife in every birth. It does not matter much even if the lover is of superior order to the lady-love.

Note 1.—The first line, according to *Iḷampūraṇar* means "the fate which either unites or separates them in the life beyond."

Note. 2. Suitability is decided by birth, heredity, bravery, age, appearance, health, good qualities like gentlemanliness, compassion, etc. This is mentioned in the 25th sūtra of the *Meyppāṭṭiyal*.

What happens when they come within the view of each other?

91. சிறந்துழி யையஞ் சிறந்த தென்ப
இழிந்துழி யிழிவே சுட்ட லான.
*Ciṟantuḻi y-aiyañ ciṟanta t-eṉpa*
*Iḻintuḻi y-iḻivē cuṭṭa lāṉa.*

Doubt about their respective nature is praiseworthy only when both are of superior birth, since the low nature is evident if they are of low pedigree.

Note 1.—Even though this *sūtra* seems to sanction that both the lover and the lady-love may doubt about the nature of the other, the line.

*Aiya-k kiḷavi y-āṭūuviṟ k-urittē.*

in the 42nd *sūtra* of *Poruḷ-iyal* restricts the application of this *sūtra*.

Note 1.—The meaning given above belongs to *Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar*. *Iḷampūraṇar* interprets that doubt may happen

only in the mind of the lover and not in the mind of the lady-love.

If so, the line of the 42nd *sūtra* of *Poruḷiyal* noted above has to be taken to be the repetition of the contents of this *sūtra*. Hence *Naccinārkkiniyar's* interpretation is sound.

What serves as the means to clear the doubt?

92. வண்டே யிழையே வள்ளி பூவே
கண்ணே யலமர லிமைப்பே யச்சமென்
றன்னவை பிறவு[1] மாங்க ணிகழ
நின்றவை களையுங் கருவி யென்ப.
*Vaṇṭ-ē y-iḻai-y ē vaḷḷi pū-v-ē*
*Kaṇ ṇ-ē y-alamara l-imaipp-ē y-accam eṉṟu*
*Aṉṉavai piṟa-vu m-āṅka ṇikaḻa*
*Niṉṟavai kaḷaiyuṅ karuvi y-eṉpa.*

Bee (on the flowers on head), ornaments (worn on the body), creeper-like lines (drawn on breast and shoulders), flowers, physical eyes, bewilderment, winking of the eyes, sense of fear, etc., found on and near her, serve as the instruments to clear the doubt (in the mind of the lover).

Note 1.—These help the lover to determine that the lady was not a divine being, but only a human being.

Which determines their mutual attachment?

93. நாட்ட மிரண்டு மறிவுடம் படுத்தற்குக்
கூட்டி யுரைக்குங் குறிப்புரை யாகும்.
*Nāṭṭa m-iraṇṭu m-aṟivuṭam paṭuttaṟku-k*
*Kūṭṭi y-uraikkuṅ kuṟippurai y-ākum.*

The meeting of the eyes of the two is the evidence to determine that they are mutually attached.

Note 1.—*Naccinārkkiniyar* takes the following as the *anvaya*:—*Aṟivu uṭampaṭuttaṟku-nāṭṭam iraṇṭum kūṭṭi uraikkum*, (*talaiviyiṉ*) *kuṟippurai nāṭṭiraṇṭum-ākum*: The meaning of the *sūtra*, according to him, is, "the lover, having determined that she is a human being, expresses through his two eyes his request that she must be a partner to him; her consent is communicated through her two eyes. This interpretation is far-fetched and unnecessary.

When will their eyes meet?

94. குறிப்பே குறித்தது கொள்ளு மாயின்
ஆங்கவை நிகழு மென்மனார் புலவர்.

1. ஆங்கண் (இளம்.) ஆங்கவண் (நச்.)

*Kuṟippē kuṟittatu koḷḷu m-āyiṉ*
*Āṅkavai nikaḻu m-eṉmaṉār pulavar.*

Learned men say that eyes will meet there only when her mind is prepared to agree to his wish.

Note 1.—According to *Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar*, *avai* refers to *puku-mukam-purital*, etc.,, mentioned in the three *sūtras* (13-15) of the *Meyppāṭṭiyal*.

Having seen that their eyes met, what does the lover do?

95. பெருமையு முரனு மாடூஉ மேன.
*Perumaiyu m-uraṉu m-āḷūu mēṉa?*

Consideration of one's own dignity and mental strength are found in man.

Note 1.—From this it is evident that high class men do not allow themselves to be carried away by passion, but they begin to consider whether it behoves their dignity to take the hand of women who allowed their eyes to meet theirs.

What does the lady-love do?

96. அச்சமு நாணு மடனு முந்துறுதல்[1]
நிச்சமும் பெண்பாற் குரிய வென்ப.
*Accamu nāṇu maṭaṉu muntuṟutal*
*Niccamum peṇpāṟ k-uriya v-eṉpa.*

They say that fear, modesty and credulity are the permanent traits of woman which exhibit themselves.

What happens after their first meeting?

97. வேட்கை யொருதலை யுள்ளுதன் மெலிதல்
ஆக்கஞ் செப்ப னாணுவரை யிறத்தல்
நோக்குவ வெல்லா மவையே போறல்
மறத்தன் மயக்கஞ் சாக்கா டென்றிச்[2]
சிறப்புடை மரபினவை களவென மொழிப.
*Vēṭkai y-orutalai y-uḷḷutaṉ melital*
*Ākkañ ceppa ṉāṇuvarai y-iṟattal*
*Nōkkuva v-ellā m-avaiyē pōṟal*
*Maṟattaṉ mayakkañ cākkā ṭ-eṉṟic*
*Ciṟappuṭai marapiṉavai kaḷaveṉa moḻipa.*

They say that the following nine important *avasthās* happen at the time of *kaḷavu*: (1) Amorousness, (2) uninter-

---

1. முந்துறுதல் (இளம்.): முந்துறுத்த (நச்.)
2. என்றிச் (இளம்.); என்றச் (நச்.)

rupted thinking of the object of love, (3) emaciation, (4) enumeration of what is experienced like sleeplessness, etc., (5) transgressing the bonds of modesty, (6) looking at all objects of nature with reference to the limbs of the object of love, (7) forgetfulness, (8) stupor and (9) the dying state.

Note 1.—*Naccinārkkiniyar* takes *orutalai* in line one as an adjunct both to *vēṭkai* and to *uḷḷutal*.

Note 2.—*Ākkañceppal* according to *Naccinārkkiniyar*, means "taking every impediment leading to the attainment of their desire."

Note 3.—The third line, according to *Naccinārkkiniyar*, means, "taking the look of others to have been cast with the knowledge of their love-affair".

When they meet next, what happens?

98. முன்னிலை யாக்கல் சொல்வழிப் படுத்தல்
நன்னய முரைத்த னகைநனி யுறாஅ[1]
அந்நிலை யறிதன் மெலிவுவிளக் குறுத்தல்
தந்நிலை யுரைத்த றெளிவகப் படுத்தலென்று
இன்னவை நிகழு மென்மனார் புலவர்.

*Munnilai y-ākkal colvaḻi-p paṭuttal*
*Nannaya m-uraitta nakai-nani y-urāa*
*Annilai y-aritan melivu-viḷak kuruttal*
*Tannilai y-uraitta reḷivakap paṭuttal-enrù*
*Innavai nikaḻu m-enmanār pulavar.*

Learned men say that these will then happen :—

(1) lover addressing the lady-love, (2) making her listen to him, (3) describing her attractive features, (4) understanding her mind through her smile, (5) making her understand clearly his suffering, (6) telling her plainly his own condition and (7) convincing himself of her determination.

Note.—The meaning given above belongs to *Iḷampūraṇar*. *Naccinārkkiniyar* condemns him for the following reasons :—(1) If the *avasthās* are mentioned here, he need not have mentioned the twelve *avasthās* beginning from "*puku-mukam-puriṭal* and ending with" *iru-kai-y-um-eṭuttal* in the *sūtras* 13, 14 or 15 in the *Meyppāṭṭiyal*. (2) It is said in the *Meyppāṭṭiyal* that the *avasthā* after the sixth cannot be taken under *akam*. (3) If *puṇarcci* is to take place after these, the statements

1. உறாஅ (இளம்-பா); உறாஅது (நச்-பா).

*Kūṭṭi y-uraikkuṅ kuṟippurai y-ākum* (Kaḷaviyal 5)
*Iru-kai-y-um-eṭuttal* (*Mey.* 15) are not appropriate.

The first reason cannot hold good, since the *avasthās* mentioned in the *Meyppāṭṭiyal* belong exclusively to the lady-love, while those mentioned here belong to both the lover and the lady-love. No *sūtra* in the *Meyppāṭṭiyal* deals with what he states in the second reason. Since the 5th *sūtra* may be taken to denote their mutual consent, the statement referred to may be taken to be appropriate. *Iru-kai-y-um-eṭuttal* has exclusive bearing to the lady-love. Hence *Naccinārkkiniyar's* condemnation of *Iḷampūraṇar* does not seem to be sound.

Note 2.—The meaning according to *Naccinārkkiniyar* is this:—(1) addressing inanimate objects, (2) telling as if they have said, (3) telling them his attractive features, (4) learning how she will put up with the separation, (5) making the lady-love understand his feeling about separation and consoling her on learning her feeling, (6) telling that they will continue to be partners for seven births to come and (7) telling the lady-love clearly that he will not leave her, that he cannot put up with the sufferings if separation is indispensable and he will lead a virtuous life during separation.

What happens afterwards?

99. மெய்தொட்டுப் பயிறல் பொய்பா ராட்டல்
இடம்பெற்றுத் தழாஅ லிடையூறு கிளத்தல்
நீடுநினைந் திரங்கல் கூடுத லுறுதல்
சொல்லிய நுகர்ச்சி வல்லே பெற்றுழித்
தீராத் தேற்ற முளப்படத் தொகைஇப்
பேராச் சிறப்பி னிருநான்கு கிளவியும்
பெற்றவழி மகிழ்ச்சியும் பிரிந்தவழிக் கலங்கலும்
நிற்பவை நினைஇ நிகழ்பவை யுரைப்பினும்
குற்றங் காட்டிய வாயில் பெட்பினும்
பெட்ட வாயில்பெற் றிரவுவலி யுறுப்பினும்
ஊரும் பேரும் கெடுதியும் பிறவும்
நீரிற் குறிப்பி னிரம்பக் கூறித்
தோழியைக் குறையுறும் பகுதியுந் தோழி
குறையவட் சார்த்தி மெய்யுறக் கூறலும்
தண்டா திரப்பினு மற்றைய வழியும்
சொல்லவட் சார்த்தலிற் புல்லிய வகையினும்
அறிந்தோ ளயர்ப்பி னவ்வழி மருங்கின்
கேடும் பீடுங் கூறலுந் தோழி
நீக்கலி னாகிய நிலைமையு நோக்கி
மடன்மா கூறு மிடனுமா ருண்டே.

*Mey-toṭṭu-p payiṟal poy-pā rāṭṭal*
*Iṭam-peṟṟu-t taḻāa l-iṭai-y-ūṟu kiḷattal*
*Nīṭu-niṉain t-iraṅkal kūṭuta l-uṟutal*
*Colliya nukarcci vallē peṟṟuḻi-t*
*Tīrā-t tēṟṟa m-uḷappaṭa-t tokaii-p*
*Pērā-c ciṟappi ṉ-iru-nāṉku kiḷavi-y-um*
*Peṟṟa-vaḻi makiḻcci-y-um pirinta-vaḻi-k-kalaṅkalum*
*Niṟpavai niṉaii nikaḻpavai y-uraippiṉum*
*Kuṟṟaṅ kāṭṭiya vāyil peṭpiṉum*
*Peṭṭa vāyil-peṟ ṟ-iravu-vaḻi y-uṟuppiṉum*
*Ūrum pēr-uṅ keṭuti-y-um piṟa-v-um*
*Nīriṟ kuṟippi ṉirampa-k kūṟi-t*
*Tōḻiyai-k kuṟai-y-uṟum pakuti-y-un-tōḻi*
*Kuṟai-y-avaṭ cārtti mey-y-uṟa k-kūṟal-um*
*Taṇṭā t-irappiṉu maṟṟaiya vaḻi-y-um*
*Col-l-avaṭ cārttaliṟ pulliya vakaiyiṉ-um*
*Aṟinto ḷ-ayarppi ṉ-a-v-vaḻi maruṅkiṉ*
*Kēṭum pīṭuṅ kūṟal-un tōḻi*
*Nīkkali ṉ-ākiya nilaimai y-u-nōkki*
*Maṭaṉ-mā kūṟu m-iṭaṉ-um-ā r-uṇṭ-ē.*

Along with the following eight of great importance—the lover's trying to touch any limb of the lady love, pleading false excuses for the same, getting near her, enumerating the obstacles he had to encounter, feeling sorry for the long delay, meeting her in conjugal union, experiencing the pleasure all on a sudden and expressing the insatiety of his lust-expressing pleasure at the meeting, expressing sorrow at separation, thinking of what is past and what is to come in her company, making his friend who found fault with his love-adventure agree to help him, the friend entreating the lady-love or her friend to agree to the lover's wishes, entreating the lady-love's friend to intercede suggesting to her the name of his native place, his name, and the perils which may follow, telling her his determination to mount himself on a horse of palmyra stems when the lady's friend, in spite of his repeated entreaties, refuses to bring about the union by telling him the exact troubles in which the lady was under, the way in which he met her for the first time without anybody's knowledge, the lady's heaving sighs, the difficulties which she would have to encounter, and (the chance for losing) his personal dignity.

Note 1.—The first three lines deal with, according to *Iḷampūraṇar*, when the lover got the opportuuity to be in con-

jugal union with the lady-love for the *first* time and according to *Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar* they refer to the incidents at their *second* union.

Note 2.—*Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar* says that, if lines 14 to 18 are taken to deal with the sayings of the lady-love's friend in the way in which *Iḷampūraṇar* does, 24th *sūtra* of this chapter must be taken to repeat what is mentioned here. But, since this *sūtra* has reference primarily to the lover, the ideas contained in them may be taken to be *purōvāda* which are necessary for the ideas contained in the last two lines of the *sūtra*. Hence *Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar's* mentioning that these lines refer to the sayings of the lover is far-fetched.

Note 3.—*Iṭai-y-ūṟu-kiḷattal* (in line 2) means, according to *Iḷampūraṇar*, "lover's asking the lady-love the obstacles that stood in *her* way" and according to *Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar*, "enumerating the obstacles that stood in *his* way". *Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar's* interpretation seems to be better.

Note 4.—*Peṟṟuḷi* (in line 4) is taken to mean *peṟutal*.

Note 5.—*Tīrā-t-tēṟṟam* in line 5, means according to *Iḷampūraṇar*, 'the insatiety of lust' and according to *Nacciṉārkkiṉiyar*, "the swearing never to part".

What are the occasions, not mentioned before, which give room for the lover to speak?

100. பண்பிற் பெயர்ப்பினு பரிவுற்று மெலியினும்
அன்புற்று நகினு மவட்பெற்று மலியினும்
ஆற்றிடை யுறுதலு மவ்வினைக் கியல்பே.

*Paṇpiṟ peyarppiṉum parivuṟṟu meliyiṉum*
*Aṉpuṟṟu nakiṉu m-avaṭ-peṟṟu maliyiṉum*
*Ā ṟṟ-iṭai y-uṟutal-u m-a-v-viṉai-k k-iyalp-ē.*

The following also come within the range of the lover's sayings:—"When he is sent away smoothly, when the lady's friend is at the point of yielding to him on account of compassion, when she or the lady smiles out of affection, when he is pleased in having got the lady's company and when he is beset with obstacles either on his return-journey or on his taking the lady-love with him (without the knowledge of her parents).

Note 1.—The word *paṇpu* in line 1 means according to the commentators 'the childish state of the lady etc.'

दृष्ट्वा विस्मयमानस्तैः स्मर्यमाणसुदुःसहैः ।
नित्योग्रेति कथं प्राह प्रभुरित्यहमब्रवम् ॥ ५० ॥

चित्रगुप्तस्तदाचख्यौ शबरेन्द्रस्य कस्यचित् ।
चौर्यलब्धः सुतः कश्चित् कोलाहलिक इत्यभूत् ॥ ५१ ॥

स मूर्खः पथिकान् निघ्नन् कदाचिद् विधवां स्त्रियम् ।
न्यरुणत् पुरुषं चैकं युवत्या च स्त्रिया सह ॥ ५२ ॥

हा दीर्घदर्शिन्! हा पुत्र! नित्योग्रेति मुहुर्मुहुः ।
आक्रन्दन्तीं पुळिन्दस्तां भद्रे! कासीति सोऽब्रवीत् ॥ ५३ ॥

सोचे मन्त्री विदर्भाणां दीर्घदर्शीति मे पतिः ।
स नित्योग्रमहोग्रावित्यात्मजौ मय्यजीजनत् ॥ ५४ ॥

श्रुतं कार्तान्तिकाद् राज्ञा मत्पुत्रो राज्यभागिति ।
बाल एव स नित्योग्रो राज्ञा चौर्यापहारितः ॥ ५५ ॥

तद्भीत्या मातुलावासं कनीयानभ्यनीयत ।
ततः कदाचिन्मे भर्ता रहसीदमुदाहरत् ॥ ५६ ॥

अद्येहाच्युतकस्याहं भागिनेयस्य नो गृहम् ।
निमित्तेन निशि प्राप्तः श्रुतवान् मन्दिरे गिरः ॥ ५७ ॥

राज्ञा जालंधरेणाहमाहूयाभिहितोऽधुना ।
मातुलस्य तवापत्यं राजा किल भविष्यति ॥ ५८ ॥

पिता चैनं प्रसह्यास्मान विवर्धयति दुर्मतिः ।
असंशयमसौ वध्यस्त्वया मत्प्रियकारिणा ॥ ५९ ॥

निशम्यैतन्नृपादिष्टं क्रियतामविलम्बितम् ।
इति स्वप्रियया प्रोक्ते क्रुद्धस्तामयमभ्यधात् ॥ ६० ॥

कर्तुं मातुलपुत्रेऽहं नैतत्साहसमुत्सहे ।
इत्यस्मिन्नन्तरे प्रीत्या तस्यात्मानमदीदृशम् ॥ ६१ ॥

इत्थं प्रोचे कथं गत्वा कृत्वा पुस्तशिरः करे ।
तच्छिरश्छद्मना च्छित्त्वा प्रत्यागच्छ नृपान्तिकम् ॥ ६२ ॥

तथेत्यच्युतकेनोक्ते निवृत्तोऽस्मीत्यनन्तरम् ।
स मयोक्तं ततः कृत्वा नृपायापि न्यवीविदत् ॥ ६३ ॥

विमनायितमालोक्य स्वदुर्नयधियेत्यसौ ।
पतिं मे नृपतिर्नक्तं विविक्ते हन्तुमाह्वयत् ॥ ६४ ॥

रात्रौ मा हन्तुमारब्धो राज्यलोभादसाविति ।
प्रख्याप्य राज्ञा पापायाः पतिर्मे विनिपातितः ॥ ६५ ॥

तस्मादच्युतको मामप्यनैषीत् पितुरन्तिकम् ।
तस्मादपि परिभ्रष्टा ततस्तस्करसम्भ्रमे ॥ ६६ ॥

ध्वस्तः किं तस्करैरित्थं भ्राम्यन्ती पुत्रचिन्तया ।
उद्बध्नतीं मृतोऽसावित्यदर्शं तरुमूर्ध्नि तम् ॥ ६७ ॥

सोऽब्रवीदम्ब ! दस्युर्मां बलादादाय निर्गतः ।
कृष्णसर्पेण दष्टस्तद्भीत्यारूढोऽस्मि शाखिनम् ॥ ६८ ॥

इत्याकर्ण्य पुनर्जातं पुत्रमादाय तद्गृहम् ।
गत्वा दस्युहते ताते शोकार्णवमगाहिषि ॥ ६९ ॥

नष्टे ज्येष्ठे सुते पत्यौ हते पितरि मारिते ।
महोग्रमात्रमासीन्मे जीवितस्यावलम्बनम् ॥ ७० ॥

तरुणीभूतमद्यैनं परिणाय्यामुना पथि ।
स्नुषया च सहायान्ती भवद्भिर्भद्र ! विद्रुता ॥ ७१ ॥

इति श्रुत्वा स एवाहं नित्योग्रस्तनयस्तव ।
इत्युदञ्जलिराह्लादी पुलिन्दस्तामवन्दत ॥ ७२ ॥

ततो मातरमादाय भ्रात्रा च शबरैः सह ।
गत्वा जालन्धरं रात्रौ जघान पितृघातिनम् ॥ ७३ ॥

स्वजनैः सह मात्रा च तत्रानन्तरभूपतेः ।
महोग्रं मन्त्रिणं कृत्वा जगाम वनमेव सः ॥ ७४ ॥

महोग्रः स गतो भक्त्या हस्तिवक्त्रसलोकताम् ।
दीर्घदर्शी विदेहेषु प्रहाराख्योऽभवन्नृपः ॥ ७५ ॥

ततस्त्रिस्रोतसः शापान्मानुष्यकमुपेयुषा ।
गणेशेन सह प्राप्तो महोग्रश्च मनुष्यताम् ॥ ७६ ॥

अपहारोपहाराख्यौ प्रहारस्य सुतौ च तौ ।
योऽसावच्युतकः सोऽभूद्धनमित्राह्वयया वणिक् ॥ ७७ ॥

उत्पन्नः सोऽपि नित्योग्रः कर्मवासनया पुनः ।
चण्डकृष्ण इति व्याधस्तं जघान रिपुञ्जयः ॥ ७८ ॥

नरकान् विविधाकारानुभूय सहस्रशः ।
जातो विप्रकुलेषु त्वं प्राप्तश्च गतिमुत्तमाम् ॥ ७९ ॥

ब्राह्मणस्य कृते प्राणैस्त्वं चेन्नैवममोक्ष्यथाः ।
पुरेव निरयान् भूयोऽप्यविषह्यानभोक्ष्यथाः ॥ ८० ॥

लौकिकानां हिताय त्वं प्रविश स्वं कलेबरम् ।
इत्युक्तमात्रे मत्क्षेत्रे तत्रैवोन्मीलितं मया ॥ ८१ ॥

वन्धुभिः स्वगृहं नीत्वा विहितव्रणरोपणः ।
स्वस्तिमान् ब्राह्मणात्तस्मादश्रौषं च श्रुतिस्मृतीः ॥ ८२ ॥

अमानुषत्वकामं मां साक्षाद्भूयायुगेक्षणः ।
अब्रवीत् सोमशापात्त्वं क्लान्तो वत्स! कपिञ्जल ॥ ८३ ॥

तदद्य नमुचेर्लोकं लभस्व बिलवर्त्मना ।
विन्ध्यपार्श्वगतस्तास्मिन् सहायं च तवाप्स्यसि ॥ ८४ ॥

इत्याकर्ण्य कुमारास्ते तस्मिन् विस्मितमानसाः ।
अवसन् दिवसान् कांश्चित् प्रीत्या तदनुरोधतः ॥ ८५ ॥

ततो मातङ्गकः सुप्तान् मुक्त्वा भक्तानुकम्पिनम् ।
राजवाहनमादाय प्रविवेश रसातलम् ॥ ८६ ॥

बिलकल्पोपदिष्टेन प्रविष्टौ यन्त्रवर्त्मना ।
रम्यं पुरमलोकेतां ताम्रप्राकारगोपुरम् ॥ ८७ ॥

स्नात्वा सरस्युपस्पृश्य प्रविश्य नगराङ्गणे ।
जातवेदसमुत्पाद्य स्थापितैः समिदादिभिः ॥ ८८ ॥

होमं मातङ्गकः कृत्वा रक्षायां राजवाहनम् ।
कल्पोक्तेन विधानेन प्रावर्तत निरर्गलः ॥ ८९ ॥

न शक्ष्यन्ति न सन्देहः प्रत्यूहा राजवाहने ।
इदं तु चित्रं तत्रापि प्रवृत्ता विहता अपि ॥ ९० ॥

हुते शरीरे केयूरी कृपाणी मकुटी क्षणात् ।
बभूव स्यन्दनीभूते निषण्णः कृष्णवर्त्मनि ॥ ९१ ॥

प्रभाप्रवाहे मज्जन्ती स्वलावण्याम्बुवर्षिणी ।
रमणीयतरा काचित् तरुणी प्रत्यदृश्यत ॥ ९२ ॥

सा तमग्निरथं दृष्ट्वा निरीक्ष्य स्निग्धया दृशा ।
स्वामिन्ननुगृहीतास्मीत्याचख्यौ राजवाहनम् ॥ ९३ ॥

तावन्तःपुरमानीय स्वर्गस्पर्धिसमृद्धिमत् ।
सम्भाव्य स्निग्धया वाचा दिव्ययोषिदभाषत ॥ ९४ ॥

मन्दाकिनीति नामास्मिन्नुत्पन्ना नमुचेरहम् ।
मृते पितरि पुत्रीव नरकेणास्मि वर्धिता ॥ ९५ ॥

कन्या यज्ञवतीत्यन्या तस्यासुरपतेरभूत् ।
आवयोरपराप्यासीत् परं मित्रं तिलोत्तमा ॥ ९६ ॥

ततो यज्ञवती जातु व्यञ्जितस्मरसंज्वरा ।
किमप्युदमनायिष्ट स्नेहादस्मभ्यमभ्यधात् ॥ ९७ ॥

धर्मदेव इति ख्यातः पुरासीत् पुरुषोत्तमात् ।
तत्पत्नीपदधन्यं मे जीवनं पूर्वजन्मनि ॥ ९८ ॥

प्रिये गुरुनियोगेन प्रोषिते बदरीवने ।
दवदग्धा तदेवाद्य स्मराम्यस्मिन् भवान्तरे ॥ ९९ ॥

इत्युन्मनासि तन्वङ्गयां कदाचित्तत्समाकृतिम् ।
कुमारं कञ्चिदाहृत्य व्याजहार तिलोत्तमा ॥ १०० ॥

जाम्बवत्यामसौ जातः साम्ब इत्यम्बुजेक्षणात् ।
मनोरथानां भूमिस्ते मुनिरक्षार्थमागतः ॥ १०१ ॥

चिरदृष्टं वनं दृष्ट्वा प्रिये यज्ञवतीत्यसौ ।
तव स्मृत्वा मुहुर्मूर्च्छां गच्छन्नीतस्तवान्तिकम् ॥ १०२ ॥

इत्युक्त्वा क्षणनिष्पन्दं मन्देतरमनोरथम् ।
आनन्दाग्रमिवारूढं तद् द्वन्द्वं समजीगमत् ॥ १०३ ॥

गणरात्रात्यये दैत्यैः श्रुत्वा यज्ञवतीं हृताम् ।
साम्बः प्राग्ज्योतिषं जेतुं प्रवृत्तः क्रुद्धया धिया ॥ १०४ ॥

नारदस्य गिरा गत्वा द्वारकां गुरुभिः सह ।
जित्वा दैत्यपतौ स्वर्गं जेतुं यातेऽहरत् प्रियाम् ॥ १०५ ॥

अमर्षज्वलिते भौमे युधि स्मर्तव्यतां गते ।
स्नुषासखीति नीताहं पुरेऽस्मिन्नसुरद्विषा ॥ १०६ ॥

महाश्वेतादयः सख्यो गन्धर्वतनया अपि ।
ममासन् सा त्वहं जातु प्रणन्तुं पङ्कजेक्षणम् ॥ १०७ ॥

प्रयान्ती तरुणं कञ्चित् पतन्तं मकरालये ।
दृष्ट्वा दिष्टबलाद् भावं तस्मिन्नकरवं पुरा ॥ १०८ ॥

अश्वरूपं तमालोक्य व्यथमाना रथाङ्गिणा ।
आदिष्टा स्पष्टमेवायं भर्ता ते भवितेत्यहम् ॥ १०९ ॥

कान्तेन सह यान्तीं मामेकदा शोकविह्वलाम् ।
आह्लादयन्महाश्वेता निजवृत्तान्तविस्तरैः ॥ ११० ॥

तयोक्तः स युवा सर्वं निवेदयितुमात्मनः ।
चरितं कथयांचक्रे ततः कादम्बरीकथाम् ॥ १११ ॥

अस्मिन् विन्ध्यवने वृद्धशाल्मलिद्रुमवर्तिनोः ।
उत्पन्नः शुकदम्पत्योरेक एवास्मि शावकः ॥ ११२ ॥

[1]बाल्ये मृता सवित्री मे मत्पोषणपरायणे ।
किरातप्रहते ताते परासावपतं द्रुमात् ॥ ११३ ॥

---

1. समास्थिता क.

नीत्वा मुनिकुमारेण स्वाश्रमं विश्रमीकृतम् ।
जाबालिर्मुनिरालोक्य स्मित्वा मामभ्यभाषत ॥ ११४ ॥

अवन्तिष्वभवद् भूपस्तारापीड इति श्रुतः ।
पुत्रः क्षत्रकुलापीडश्चन्द्रापीडस्ततोऽभवत् ॥ ११५ ॥

मन्त्रिणः शुकनासस्य वैशम्पायन इत्यभूत् ।
तौ बहिर्नगरं गत्वा विद्यापारमपश्यताम् ॥ ११६ ॥

विद्यान्ते षोडशे वर्षे चन्द्रापीडं नराधिपः ।
आनीयेन्द्रायुधं दत्त्वा यौवराज्येऽभ्यषेचयत् ॥ ११७ ॥

दिग्जयाय ततो गत्वा हिमवत्पार्श्ववर्तिनि ।
सवैशम्पायने सैन्ये किन्नरद्वयमन्वगात् ॥ ११८ ॥

इन्द्रायुधजवाद् दूरं गत्वाच्छोदसरस्तटे ।
गीतानुसारी गत्वासावद्राक्षीद्दिव्ययोषितम् ॥ ११९ ॥

तयोपचरितः सर्वं व्यावर्ण्य चरितं निजम् ।
तद्वृत्तान्तमथापृच्छन्निश्वस्याभिदधे च सा ॥ १२० ॥

महाश्वेतेति नाम्नाहं गन्धर्वाधिपतेः सुता ।
सा त्वहं पुण्डरीकाह्वे भाववत्यभवं द्विजे ॥ १२१ ॥

चन्द्रोदये सुदुर्वारं स्मरसागरमुद्वहन् ।
जहौ प्राणान् घृणाहीना विलपामि[1] स्म केवलम् ॥ १२२ ॥

पुरुषस्तं जहारैकश्चन्द्रमण्डलनिर्गतः ।
वत्से ! मनोरथप्राप्तिर्भवितेत्यभिधाय माम् ॥ १२३ ॥

कपिञ्जलः सखा तस्य द्रुतमेव तमन्वयात् ।
अहं पुनरिहैवास इत्याम्नायत सा भृशम् ॥ १२४ ॥

तामाश्वास्य तया सार्धं गत्वा गन्धर्वकन्यकाम् ।
कादम्बरीं ददर्शाथ प्रेमव्यक्तिरभूत्तयोः ॥ १२५ ॥

---

1. विललापास्मि. क.

परेद्युः शिबिरं गत्वा सत्वरं पितुराज्ञया ।
ताम्बूलदायिकां दत्त्वा कादम्बर्यै गृहं ययौ ॥ १२६ ॥

ततः कदाचिदापेदे कादम्बर्याः समीपतः ।
पत्रलेखाथ संक्रान्ते तद्वृत्तान्तमवर्णयत् ॥ १२७ ॥

अभूतपूर्वामन्यत्र प्रेयस्याः स्मरविक्रियाम् ।
आकर्ण्य तां स्मरन् कान्तां मुहुर्मोहमगादसौ ॥ १२८ ॥

कटकक्षोभकर्तारं श्रुत्वा हेमजटेश्वरम् ।
कुमारे[1] गन्तुमारब्धे पपात द्युपथाद् रथः ॥ १२९ ॥

श्रुत्वा चित्ररथप्रेष्यात् कादम्बर्याः स्वयंवरम् ।
तदेव रथमारुह्य प्रहृष्टैर्गुरुभिः सह ॥ १३० ॥

स्कन्धावारं ततो गत्वा चन्द्रापीडः ससैनिकः ।
सवैशम्पायनस्तूर्णं गन्धर्वनगरं ययौ ॥ १३१ ॥

ततस्तस्योरसि स्नेहात् परिहृत्य सुरासुरान् ।
चक्रे चैत्ररथी तत्र श्लाघ्यां सन्तानजस्रजम् ॥ १३२ ॥

स्वयंवरकृते युद्धे श्रुत्वा मन्त्रिसुतं हतम् ।
बद्धरागा महाश्वेता चुक्रोश भृशदुःखिता ॥ १३३ ॥

अपापामसतीबुध्या शशाप कुपितः पिता ।
चण्डालयोनिं गच्छेति सद्यः सा त्वपतन्मृता ॥ १३४ ॥

स वैशम्पायनस्तस्या दर्शनात् पूर्वजन्मनः ।
स्मरन्निवृत्तः समरात्तां निशम्याजहादसून् ॥ १३५ ॥

चन्द्रापीडेन देव्या च कादम्बर्या तथापरैः ।
प्रायोपवेशमारब्धं वारयन्नारदोऽब्रवीत् ॥ १३६ ॥

श्रूयतां पुण्डरीकोऽसौ ध्वस्तः कुसुमधन्वना ।
रूपाभिमानी मात्सर्यान्महाश्वेतानिमित्ततः ॥ १३७ ॥

1. 'ह'. ग·

जहार चन्द्रस्तत्कायं सखायं च कपिञ्जलम् ।
मर्त्यो भवेति शप्तारं शशापेन्दुरपि क्रुधा ॥ १३८ ॥

दुर्गेषु प्रभ्रमेत्युक्तश्चन्द्रापीडात्मना स्थितम् ।
कपिञ्जलस्तमेवास्मिन्नश्वो भूत्वानुवर्तते ॥ १३९ ॥

वैशम्पायन इत्यस्मिन् भूत्वा चित्तभुवैत्र सः ।
पुण्डरीको हतः शप्ता वृथा चेयं तपस्विनी ॥ १४० ॥

तद्भवन्तः प्रतीक्षन्तां कञ्चित्कालमिति ब्रुवन् ।
तिरोऽभून्नारदस्तेऽमी शोकव्याकुलमासते ॥ १४१ ॥

स वैशम्पायनः पश्चात् तिरश्चीं जातिमाश्रितः ।
महाश्वेतापि मातङ्गीं प्राप्ता जातिमनुत्तमाम् ॥ १४२ ॥

इत्युक्त्वा स्मृतजातिं मां निनीषुः शिष्यमभ्यधात् ।
सोऽयं चण्डालकन्यायै दीयतामभिधीयताम् ॥ १४३ ॥

स्मरायं ते महाश्वेते! मनोरथशतार्थितः ।
सोऽयं मालवराजाय शूद्रकाय निवेद्यताम् ॥ १४४ ॥

तत्राभीष्टिर्भवित्री वां स राजा नन्दिकेश्वरः ।
भवानीशापतो जातः स्त्रीभिश्चतसृभिः सह ॥ १४५ ॥

जिगीषाग्राहमुत्सृज्य त्रिवर्गेष्वपराङ्मुखः ।
स चन्द्रापीडचरितश्रवणेन भविष्यति ॥ १४६ ॥

इत्युक्ते तेन तां नीतस्तया चापि नृपान्तिकम् ।
तत्राकथयमात्मीयां कथां तदनुयोगतः ॥ १४७ ॥

ततः शशिकरानीतं स्वशरीरमशिश्रयम् ।
महाश्वेताशरीरं च रक्षितं सोमरश्मिभिः ॥ १४८ ॥

अवतारितमारूढा तं देहमपहाय सा ।
तावावां मुक्तसंक्लेशौ त्वामेव द्रष्टुमागतौ ॥ १४९ ॥

इत्याकर्ण्य गते तूर्णं तस्मिन् द्वन्द्वेऽभिवन्दितुम् ।
मुकुन्दचरणद्वन्द्वं प्राप्तां मामित्युवाच सः ॥ १५० ॥

Sri S. T. G. VARADACHARY, M.A., Principal, Narasimha Sanskrit College, Chittigudur, Masulipatam:—

अधीतमध्यापितमार्जितं यशः तथापि नूनं श्रम एव संभृतः ।
विधेहि तस्मान्मयि निर्वृतिं परां प्रपन्न एवं विदुषा स पातु वः ॥ १ ॥
अवैषि शास्त्रेषु कृतावगाहनो गाम्भीर्यमेषां न तथापरो जनः ।
यथा जिघृक्षुः सुमणीन् महोदधेर्न नाविको लङ्घनबद्धमानसः ॥ २ ॥
भवता पदवी च तया च भवानुभयेन कलानिलयः शुशुभे ।
त्रितयं च मिथः सदृशं गणयन् सुजनः सकलो नितरां मुमुदे ॥ ३ ॥
विद्यावाचस्पतिरसि वङ्गैर्दर्शनकलानिधिर्यतिभिः ।
प्रभुभिर्महामहोपाध्यायो गुरुभिः कुलपतिश्च ॥ ४ ॥
बहुधैवं भूयोभिर्भणितः सन्नेकैकोऽद्वितीयश्च ।
बिभृषे ब्रह्मन् ब्रह्मण आभामथवा तदेवासि ॥ ५ ॥
आन्तं न विच्छेदमवाप्नुतो यदध्यक्षता ते जितकाशिता च ।
अनुग्रहोऽयं नियमेन वाण्या भवत्समाराधनपोषितायाः ॥ ६ ॥
धन्यो भवानस्ति यतोऽपनीतं वाग्देवताया ऋणमप्यशेषम् ।
तदर्थिनामेवमनुग्रहेण तद्विद्विषां चापि सुनिग्रहेण ॥ ७ ॥
शिष्याः सदा श्राम्यत एव दिक्षु साकं यशोभिस्तव विप्रकीर्णाः ।
कृतित्वमेवं भजतो भवेत्ते विश्रान्तिरायुष्यमनामयं च ॥ ८ ॥
प्रथमस्ते शिष्याणां वरदाख्यो महत्त्वयोपकृतः ।
निरतिशयां त्वयि भक्तिं गुरूत्तमैवं प्रकाशयते ॥ ९ ॥

Prof. C. KUNHAN RAJA, Head of the Sanskrit Department, University of Madras, Triplicane, Madras:—

कुप्पुस्वामिसुधीरयं द्युमणिरप्यस्तं गतः साम्प्रतं
प्रक्रान्ता च निरस्तचन्द्रकिरणा घोरा निशा शाश्वती ।
कष्टं संस्कृतसाहितीजगदिदं सान्द्रान्धकारावृतं
संवृत्तम्, जनचित्तपद्मनिकराः सर्वे निमीलन्ति च ॥ १ ॥
मार्गस्यान्वेषणसुविधुरान् हन्त बंभ्रम्यमाणान्
कस्मादस्मान् निबिडतिमिरे दुर्घटेऽस्मिन्नरण्ये ।
त्यक्त्वा यातो भवदनुचरान् कान्दिशीकान् विषण्णान्
हा धिग्दैवं यदिह सुहृदप्यार्तिदो भूरमीषाम् ॥ २ ॥
तर्कव्याकरणादयः सचकिताः पश्यन्ति शून्या दिशो
मीमांसाद्य निराश्रया लुठति सा क्षोणीतले धूसरा ।
मूकाद्वैतकथा सगद्गदमियं कोणे स्थिता शोचति
त्वत्प्रेयस्यपि साहिती च विधवा जाता भृशं रोदिति ॥ ३ ॥

वेधा नूनं विबुधपतिनाभ्यर्थितो वैदिकात् स-
न्मार्गाद्भ्रंशोन्मुखमिह जनं धारयिष्यंश्चिराय ।
आदायांशानृषिवरमहायोगिसिद्धेश्वराणा-
माचार्याणामसृजदवनौ त्वां गुरुं पुण्यराशिम् ॥ ४ ॥
अध्यापयन् बहून् शिष्यांस्तान् संस्थाप्योचिते पदे ।
निर्वृत्तकृत्योऽद्य भवांश्चिरं जीयाद्दिवं गतः ॥ ५ ॥
"सानौ मेरोर्विजयी" =1842507 (5-9-43) कलितसुखं कल्पवृक्षमूलेषु ।
गीष्पतिकृतबहुमानो देशिकपदवीमलंकुरु स्वःस्थः ॥ ६ ॥

SRI T. S. BALASUBRAHMANYAM, M. A., L. T., Superintendent of Oriental Schools, Madras:—

नमो नमः श्रीगुरुपादुकाभ्याम्

एते किल आचार्यपूज्यपादाः आशैशवात् अमरभारतीमिमां आसेवमानाः, राजकीयभाषया आङ्ग्लवाण्या समाश्लिष्यमाणाश्च, पदवाक्यप्रमाणपारावारपारीणाः, अत एव विमलान्तरङ्गाः कुशाग्रीयस्वान्ताः, बुद्धेर्वैशद्यमादधानाः, संस्कृतसाम्राज्य-नभोमण्डले पण्डिततारागणानां मध्ये चन्द्रमा इव विरेजुः, इति न हि किञ्चित् आवेदनीयं विद्यते सुधियां सन्निधौ । अमी किल महान्तः कविकुलतिलकस्य महाकवेः श्रीकालिदासस्य

"आकारसदृशप्रज्ञः प्रज्ञया सदृशागमः ।
आगमैःसदृशारम्भ आरम्भसदृशोदयः ॥"

इत्यस्याः सूक्तेः परमं निदर्शनमिति विपश्चितामपरोक्षोऽयं विषयः ॥

किञ्च, पश्यामश्च लोके, अध्ययने केवले आसक्तान् गेहेशूरान् कतिचित् बिरुदभाजः । तथा अध्यापनमात्रपटून् बहून् पण्डिततल्लजान् । एवं प्रचारणैकप्रवणान पुराणशरणांश्चान्यान् । न हि कुत्रचित् पश्यामो अमीषां गुणानाम् ऐकाधिकरण्यम् , वर्जयित्वा अस्माकं गुरुराजान् । ते हि भगवत्याः श्रीकामाक्ष्याः कटाक्षवीक्षणात् , समवाप्तसमस्तगुणगणाभिरामाः, अधीतिबोधाचरणप्रचारणाह्वयैः उपायैश्चतुर्भिरपि समस्तं संस्कृतसाम्राज्यं प्रशासतो मूकायमानान् अपि शिष्यगणान् वाक्पतिसदृशान् अकार्षुरिति घण्टाघुष्टोऽयं विषयः । अत एव विद्यावाचस्पतिरिति बिरुदमपि युक्तमेवेत्युत्पश्यामो वयम् ॥

भोः शिष्यवत्सला गुरुनाथाः ! कियन्तो नाम अन्तेवासिनो भवत्पादमूलमुपेत्य अन्तेवासिपदमन्वर्थीकुर्वाणाः अन्नवस्त्रादिभिः परिपुष्टाः, विद्याविनयसम्पन्नाः पण्डित-वरेण्याः भुवि विराजन्ते, तत्र तत्र बृहतीषु सभासु तथा महतीषु कलाशालासु च । कति वा निगूढे ग्रन्थागारगह्वरे विलीनाः दर्शनादिग्रन्थाः विविदुषूणां नयनगोचरं प्रापिताः तत्रभवतां प्रयासमहिम्ना । अत एव दर्शनकलानिधिरिति बिरुदमपि युज्यत एव गुरुपादानामिति मुक्तकण्ठं निर्ब्रूमो वयम् ॥

अन्यच, भूयसां ग्रन्थानां व्याख्यारचनया तथा आङ्ग्लभाषया परिवर्तनेन च न केवलं भारते एकदेशे, अपि तु पाश्चात्यदेशेषु विद्योतमानाः पटुमतयः पण्डितप्रकाण्डा अपि भवतां शिष्यकोटौ समुट्टङ्किता विलसन्ति । अत एव च महामहोपाध्याया इति बिरुदमपि राजकीयं, तथा कुलपतिलक्षणमपि, आत्मनोऽनुरूपैर्भवद्भिः सङ्गतमित्याकलयामः ॥

एवं विद्यावन्तः श्रीमन्तः कीर्तिमन्तश्च एते पञ्चनदक्षेत्रीयसंस्कृतमहाकलाशालायां, तथा मद्रपुरीसंस्कृतमहापाठशालायां, तथा मद्रपुर्यां राजकीयमहाकलाशालायामपि अध्यापकवर्यपदवीमलङ्कृत्य च्छात्राणामुपदेशमनुशासतः सुबहुकालं सुरसरस्वतीं सभक्ति सम्पूजयामासुः । तत्रापि पञ्चविंशतिवर्षकालं मद्रपुरीराजकीयमहाकलाशालायां संस्कृतप्रवक्तृपदवीमधिरूढा एते इत्यतिमहत्प्रमोदस्थानमस्माकम् । अन्ते च तस्याः विरामं सम्प्राप्य, संस्कृतभाषाभिवर्धनमेव आत्मनो जन्मसाफल्यमिति कृतचिन्ताः आत्मनः शरीरस्यास्वास्थ्यमप्यविगणय्य अण्णामलैविश्वविद्यालयेऽपि चतुरो वर्षान् अध्यापकवर्यपदवीमास्थाय शिष्याणां चक्षूंषि ज्ञानाञ्जनेनोन्मीलयामासुः ॥

एवमात्मनो निखिलामपि जीवशक्तिं विद्याविषये विनियुञ्जानाः तत्तत्काले पत्रमुखेनापि विदेशीयानां छात्रगणानां संशयग्रन्थीन् च्छिन्दन्त एते "जातस्य हि ध्रुवो मृत्युः ध्रुवं जन्म मृतस्य च । तस्मादपरिहार्येऽर्थे न त्वं शोचितुमर्हसि ॥" इत्यादिभगवद्वचनं निदर्शयन्तोऽस्माल्लोकाद्दिव्यं लोकमारुरुहुः ॥

एवमस्माकमुपकृतवतां शिष्यवत्सलानां गुरुपादानां प्रतिक्रियां कर्तुं वयमसमर्थाः सर्वथा किं कुर्मः । अथापि "आचिरादुपकर्तुराचरेत् अथवात्मौपयिकीमुपक्रियाम् ॥" इति श्रीहर्षोक्तिमाश्रित्य तेषामात्मनः शान्तिं, तैरधिकृतानां कुलानां शश्वदभिवृद्धिं च करुणार्द्रहृदया श्रीकामकोटीकामाक्षी सन्तनोतु इति लोकमातरं सम्प्रार्थ्य, आधमर्ण्यमस्मदीयं किञ्चित् अधरीकुर्मः ॥

SRI U. VENKATAKRISHNA RAO, Lecturer in Sanskrit, Christian College, Tambaram :—

अस्माकं विनयाधानाद्रक्षणाद्भरणादपि ।
स पिता पितरोऽस्माकं केवलं जन्महेतवः ॥
यं ब्रह्माणमिव देवी वाग्वश्येवान्ववर्तत ।
विद्यावाचस्पतिः सोऽयं ब्रह्मभूयं गतोऽधुना ॥
मातृहीना वयं बाला गुरुप्रेम्णाभिवर्धिताः ।
अस्माकमेव सम्पत्त्या कृतकृत्यः स्वयं बभौ ॥
प्रभाकरसमो ज्ञाने वक्तृत्वे गीष्पतिप्रभः ।
आनन्दो ध्वनिपद्धत्यां शास्त्रमार्गेऽपि शङ्करः ।
गङ्गेशो न्यायसरणौ मीमांसायां प्रभाकरः ॥

अज्ञानतिमिरान्धानां नेत्रदाने पराशरः ।
सच्छास्त्रयोनिर्दीपोऽसौ ब्रह्मनिर्वाणमेत्ययम् ॥

MRS. DEVAKI MENON, M.A., L.T., Lecturer in Sanskrit, Queen Mary's College, Mylapore :—

येभ्यो ह्यधिगता विद्या संसारतिमिरावृते ।
मत्पथे दीपवद्भाति तान् वन्दे महितान् गुरून् ॥

SRI. T. CHANDRASEKHARAN, M.A.,L.T., Lecturer in Sanskrit, Government Victoria College, Palghat :—

पक्षे शुक्ले तिथौ षष्ठ्यां स्वभान्वङ्कितवत्सरे ।
उष्णरश्मौ गते सिंहं मदाचार्या दिवं गताः ॥ १
यैश्च तुल्यो न कोऽप्यन्यो न भूतो न भविष्यति ।
आङ्ग्लसंस्कृतपाण्डित्ये शिष्यप्रवचनेषु च ॥ २
येषां वक्त्रेन्दुनिःष्यन्दवचनामृतरक्षिताः ।
भयेन रहिता आस्म नूनं सर्वत्र सर्वदा ॥ ३
सर्वे गतं संप्रति शोचनीयतां
शास्त्राणि शिष्याः सुहृदश्च बान्धवाः ।
एतद्विहायेह गता अमर्त्यतां
दिवौकसान् शिक्षयितुं नु किं भवेत् ॥ ४

DR. V. RAGHAVAN, M.A., PH. D., Department of Sanskrit, University of Madras :—

प्राच्यप्रतीच्यविद्याकूलंकषशेमुषीकानाम् ।
अनुकुर्युः के कीर्तिं महामहाचार्यवर्याणाम् ॥ १
पदे यत्पदं नैव चस्खाल, वाक्यं
यदीयं सदा वाक्यमाकाङ्क्षते स्म ।
प्रमाणे प्रमाणं च ये, ते महान्त-
स्त्रिधामान आसन् स्वमेधोरुगायाः ॥ २
येषामुपनिषन्मार्गे नासीदुपनिषत्क्वचित् ।
रसो रसे महान् येषां ते बभुः सर्वपार्षदाः ॥ ३
बह्वयः पद्धतयो यैः प्राचीनापूर्वलुप्तशास्त्राणाम् ।
नीताः पुनः प्रकाशं विद्याब्रह्माण एव ते रेजुः ॥ ४
विद्वद्भिर्मर्शिसमितिर्विद्याशालापि वा काचित् ।
सा नास्ति भारतोर्व्यां यस्यां ते नायका नासन् ॥ ५
ददुर्ज्ञानं ददुर्वृत्तिमूचुश्च प्रेमपेशलम् ।
जजागरुश्च क्षेमाय को गुरुः स्यात्तथा पिता ॥ ६

येषां स्वकीर्तेः शिष्याणां कीर्तिरिष्टा महात्मनाम् ।
उक्त्वा तानस्मदाचार्यान् वक्ष्यामोऽन्यान् गुरून् कथम् ॥ ७
मोक्षादपि भुवि ज्ञानदानं ये मेनिरेऽधिकम् ।
अपूर्वबोधिसत्त्वेभ्यस्तेभ्यः सन्तु नमांसि नः ॥ ८

PANDIT P. S. ANANTANARAYANA SASTRI, Retired Sanskrit Pandit, Maharaja's College, Ernakulam:—

हा गैर्वाणि हतासि, पण्डिततते नष्टं तवालम्बनं,
नव्योपज्ञगवेषणस्य सरणे, शोच्यास्यनाथा चिरम् ।
शास्त्रज्ञो रसिको महोन्नतपदारूढो नृपैरादृतो
कुप्पुस्वामिसुधीर्विहाय सकलं धाम प्रपेदे परम् ॥

सुधीन्द्रस्यास्य विपुलामगाधामपि वैदुषीम् ।
कथं वेदानि दूरस्थो गाम्भीर्यमिव वारिधेः ॥
विश्वविद्यामन्दिरस्य शिरोमणिपरीक्षकः ।
तत्पादमूलं प्राप्तोऽयं जनो वर्षचतुष्टये ॥
1 महीशूरपुरे सर्वप्राच्यविज्ञानसंसदि ।
यदा संनिहितश्चासं तदा किंचिदवेदिषम् ॥
सर्वज्ञस्यास्य विदुषो लोचनानामभूत् त्रयम् ।
पूर्वोत्तरे द्वे मीमांसे तृतीयं ध्वनिलोचनम् ॥
व्युत्पतिवादमञ्जूषाखण्डदेवरहस्यवित्[2] ।
शाब्दबोधप्रकारेषु त्रिष्वयं तुल्यनैपुणः ॥
मीमांसकोऽपि रसिको गुरुरप्यधिकानतः ।
महोन्नतपदस्थोऽपि निःस्वानां सुधियां सुहृत् ॥
नव्यसंस्काराग्रयातोऽप्यार्षजीवितभासुरः ।
विरुद्धानां समावेशभूमिराश्चर्यपूरुषः ॥
महीशूरपुरे भुक्तं तदीयं वाङ्मयामृतम् ।
इदानीमपि माधुर्यधुर्यं नो जीर्णतां गतम् ॥
हा विधेरतिनैर्घृण्यं मादृशां धिगभाग्यताम् ।
यदयं दिवमारोहदपूर्णपुरुषायुषः ॥

PANDITARAJA V. SUBRAHMANYA SASTRI, Sanskrit Dept., Annamalai University:—

येषामन्तेवासिनः केचित् महामहोपाध्यायाः दिगन्तेषु विराजन्ते, अपरे राजकीयकलालयेषु संस्कृतविभागाध्यक्षपदवीं सर्वकलालयविमर्शकाध्यक्षपदं चालंकुर्वन्ति, अन्ये संस्कृतकलाशालासु अध्यक्षपदमधितिष्ठन्ति, परे च आङ्ग्लकलालयेषु

1. Mysore Oriental Conference. 2. भाट्टरहस्यवित्

संस्कृतकलाशालासु च शास्त्राण्यध्यापयन्ति, किं बहुना यदीयैः छात्रैः व्याप्तोऽयं संस्कृतलोकः, यदीयवैदुष्यसमाकृष्टमानसा मेधाविनः प्रभुवर्या आसन् सन्ति च, तेषां महामहोपाध्यायादिबिरुदभूषणायमाणानां धीराग्रगण्यानां कीर्तिशेषं गतानां ब्रह्म-श्रीयुतकुप्पुस्वामिशास्त्रिपादानां गुणवर्णनं वाचः शुद्धिमाधास्यतीति मन्वानोऽत्र प्रवर्ते॥

पण्डितमण्डलीषु ये विरलप्रचाराः अथवा निष्प्रचाराः प्रौढाः प्राचीना प्रबन्धाः ते सर्वे एभिरेव महाशयैः अध्ययनाध्यापनसंप्रदायप्रवर्तनेन प्रचुरप्रचारा दृश्यन्ते । स्वनामश्रवणमात्रजनितविद्वल्लोकभीतिः लघुचन्द्रिका विलासैः अन्तर्वाणि-कुलमौलिमणीनेतानुल्लासयन्ती समवर्तत । शाब्दबोधविचारकुतूहलिनामेषां न्याय-कुसुमाञ्जलिप्रभृतिषु विषमेषु प्राचीननिबन्धेषु चिरकालविचारसंजातनिष्कर्षो मादृशानां संशयजालानि प्रदीपो घनान्धकारामिव तत्क्षण एव न्यवर्तयत् । एतदुपज्ञमेव शास्त्रग्रन्थेषु सर्वकलाशालापरीक्षाप्रश्नधोरणी शास्त्रज्ञभूयिष्ठोत्तरदशीय-प्रश्नपद्धतीरतिशेते । न सन्त्येव हि पण्डिताः अस्मिन् जनपदे, ये नान्वभूवन् एषां विना पक्षपातं शास्त्रार्थविचारानुभवजं, दुरूहविषमग्रन्थशोधनसंदर्शनजातं, वाचस्पति-मार्गानुगामिगीर्वाणवाणीप्रसङ्गाकर्णनजन्मानं चाह्लादं, नाभजन् वा एभ्यः संमानम् । न कोऽपि पुरोभागी एषु दोषलेशमपि ददर्श ॥

एतदनुग्रहभाजनस्य हायनचतुष्टयम् अण्णामलै·विश्वविद्यालये भाग्यसंजातत-दनुचरभावस्यास्य जनस्य साक्षादनुभूतवस्तुकथने एवाधिकारः, न पुनस्तेषां पूर्वमीमांसादिशास्त्रेषु असाधारणीं नैपुणीं, सर्वकलालयपरिषत्सु वादकौशलं विमर्शनपद्धतिं, पाश्चात्यदेशीयविदुषां तेषु बहुमानातिशयं चाधिकृत्य किमपि वक्तुमिति विरमामि ॥

Sri. P. Panchapagesa Sastri, Sanskrit Dept., Annamalai University :—

एते किल शास्त्रिमहोदया नैसर्गिकेण संस्कारातिशयेन कुलक्रमानुगतेन वासनाप्राबल्येन चैषां शैशवमारभ्यैव गैर्वाण्यां वाण्यामनितरसाधरण्यभिरुचिः साभिनिवेशा प्रवृत्तिश्चासीत् । श्रूयते हि शैशव एव तेषां मूकपञ्चशत्यादयो बहवः स्तुतिग्रन्था मुखस्था आसन्निति, बाल्य एव संस्कृतभाषायां सुदृढा व्युत्पत्तिरावर्जित-कोविदाभूदिति च । अपि चातिगहनानि शास्त्राण्यप्यध्याप्यैताननुग्रहीतुमिवागत्य एतदीयाभिजनाग्रहार एव कतिपयकालं कृतवसतीनां साक्षात्कृतपरतत्त्वानां यतिवर्याणां परमानुग्रहपात्रतां कौमार एव प्राप्य तत्कृपया जैमिनीये वैयासिक्ये च तन्त्रे कूलङ्कषमगाधं पाण्डित्यमासादयन् । ततस्तत्तदभिज्ञानाचार्यान् यथावदुपास्य गौतमीये, काणादे, पाणिनीये च तन्त्रे वैदुष्यातिशयमभजन्त । शास्त्राभ्यसनविषये अनितरसाधारणमत्युत्कटमौत्सुक्यं शास्त्रिवर्याणाम् । तथा हि—यदा ते यतीश्वरा स्तद्ग्राममागतास्तदा शास्त्रिणस्तञ्जानगरे राजकीयविद्याभ्यसननिरता अभूवन् । यतीन्द्राणामागमनमवगत्य तत्पादसेवया मीमांसाभ्यसनकौतूहलाक्रान्तहृदयाः शास्त्रिणः

प्रतिसप्ताहं शुक्रवासरस्यापराह्ण एव तञ्जानगरात् प्रस्थाय सायाह्ण एव यतिराट्सविधमागत्य आगामिसोमवासरस्य प्रातःकालावधि तथा अन्येषु कलाशालाविरामदिनेषु च तेषां निकटे तथा श्रद्धया ऐकाग्र्येण च पूर्वोत्तरे मीमांसे अधीतवन्तः यथा ते मुनीन्द्राः शिष्यधौरेयस्य श्रद्धाप्रतिभादिना विस्मितान्तरङ्गाः पात्रविशेषे सङ्क्रामितं स्वशास्त्रं नूनं सहस्रशाखं फलिष्यतीति धिया आवश्यकान् नियमविशेषानपि शिथिलयन्तोऽध्यापयामासुरेतान् ॥

एवं सुकुशलैराचार्यैस्तत्तद्विद्यासु विनीताः पुष्कलया विज्ञानशक्त्या संपन्नाः, शास्त्रिमहोदया गैर्वाणीपरिचरणं तद्विद्यासंप्रदायप्रवर्तनं चैव स्वधर्म इति कृतनिश्चयाः स्वाध्यवसितार्थनिर्वहणक्षमां प्रभुशक्तिं सहकारिणीं प्रतिपालयन्ति स्म । गैर्वाणीप्रणयिनां प्रभुवर्याणां मार्गदर्शिनः सचिवाग्रेसरा धन्यमहाशयाः **वे. श्रीकृष्णस्वाम्यार्यवर्याः** स्वार्जितस्य धनस्य समुचितं विनियोगं प्रकल्पयन्तो मद्रनगर्यां वैदिकशास्त्रसंप्रवर्तनपटीयसीं कलाशालां प्रतिष्ठाप्य तदाध्यक्ष्ये शास्त्रिवर्यान् न्ययुञ्जत । शास्त्रिणश्च अन्येषां पण्डितवर्याणां साहाय्येन बहून् शिष्यान् पूर्वोत्तरे मीमांसे सपरिष्कारमध्यापयामासुः ये तदन्तेवासिनः पूर्वोत्तरमीमांसाविशारदा न केवलं दाक्षिणभारते परं तु काश्यां वङ्गधरायां च मीमांसासंप्रदायं प्रवर्तयन्ति ॥

शास्त्रिमहाशयानां पाठप्रवचनपद्धतिरन्यादृशी निरुपमा च । दुरवगाहानर्थानंशतो विभज्य एकैकमप्यंशं सोपबृंहणं सुविशदं च निरूप्य तद्ग्रन्थकृत आशयं प्रथममाविष्कुर्युः । अनन्तरम् ऐतिहासिकसरण्या तमेव विषयमधिकृत्य ग्रन्थान्तरकृतां आशयान परस्परतारतम्यपरिशीलनपूर्वकमवबोधयेयुः । मध्यमाधिकारिणामपि शिष्याणां बुद्धौ निखिलमप्यर्थजातं निस्सन्देहं सुस्पष्टं च यथा रूढं भवेत्तथा शिक्षणे विचक्षणा एते । शास्त्रिवर्यविनीयमानानां श्रद्धालूनामन्तेवासिनां तत्तच्छास्त्रे द्वित्रग्रन्थाध्ययनेनैव बहुग्रन्थाध्ययनफलमासादितं भवेत् ॥

किं च प्रायशः चत्वारिंशत्संवत्सरेभ्यः पूर्वम् अखिलभारतसंस्कृतपरिषदः संमेलनं कदाचित् काञ्च्याम् अन्यदा पञ्चनदक्षेत्रे च प्रवृत्तम् । तत्र च धर्मतत्त्वपरीक्षणाय नानादेशेभ्यो बहवः पाण्डितप्रकाण्डाः संमिलिताः । तस्याः परिषदः कार्यनिर्वाहाय कार्यदर्शिस्थाने शास्त्रिवर्या नियुक्ता अभूवन् । तत्र च पारिषदानां पुरतो विचारणीयस्य विषयस्य निर्देशनप्रकारे, वादिप्रतिवादिनोर्विषयपरिशोधनरीतौ, तयोरभिप्रायानुवदनक्रमे, ताटस्थ्यमवलम्ब्य तत्त्वविवेचनविधौ च शास्त्रिवर्यैः सर्वमनोरञ्जकमन्यादृशं वैदग्ध्यमाविष्कृतम् ॥

इत्थं शास्त्रिवर्याणां बहुशाखं पाण्डित्यम्, श्रोतृमनोहारिणीं वाग्वैखरीम्, अध्यापने अनितरसाधारणं पाटवम्, विषयपरीक्षणे आर्जवम्, आध्यक्ष्यनिर्वहणे नैपुणीं चावगत्य विश्वस्तहृदयाः प्रभुवर्याः प्रथमे वयसि वर्तमानानामपि शास्त्रिवर्याणां मद्रविश्वविद्यालये संस्कृतकार्यसंपादिकासु सर्वासु सभासु स्थानं सभाध्यक्ष्येण साकम-

कल्पयन् । तदासाद्य शास्त्रिवर्यैर्दक्षिणभारते संस्कृतविद्याभिवृद्धये भूयानुपकारः कृतः। तथा हि—पूर्वं मद्रविश्वविद्यालये प्राच्यविद्यानां समुचितं स्थानं न प्रक्लृप्तम्। तद्वैकल्यपरिपूर्तये शास्त्रिवर्या बहुधा प्रयतन्ते स्म। ततः संस्कृतप्रणयिनाममन्दोद्यमफलतया प्राच्यविद्यानां देशभाषाणां च विश्वविद्यालये समुचितं स्थानं प्रकल्पितम्। नानाशास्त्रेषु देशभाषासु च विश्वविद्यालयाधिकारिभिः परीक्षा प्रवर्तिता। तत्परीक्षोत्तीर्णानां शिरोमणिरिति विद्वानिति च बिरुदं वितीर्णम्। तदा गैर्वाण्यां तत्तत्परीक्षोपयोगिपाठ्यग्रन्थसङ्ग्रहादिसंपादकसमितौ (Board of Studies in Sanskrit) आध्यक्ष्यमावहन्तः सूक्ष्मदृशः शास्त्रिवर्या अध्येतॄणामधिकारतारतम्यमालोच्य गैर्वाण्यां वाण्यां पटुतमां व्युत्पत्तिम्, शास्त्रेष्वगाधगमनाविलं पाण्डित्यम्, आधुनिकविमर्शकसरणिमर्यादापरिज्ञानं च काङ्क्षमाणानां शिरोमणिप्रस्थानम्, संस्कृतभाषायां व्युत्पत्तिम्, शास्त्रार्थसारपरिज्ञानम् आधुनिकविमर्शकपराणामतिमहतीं नैपुणीं च प्रतीच्छतां संस्कृत-आनर्स् प्रस्थानं चेति संस्कृताध्ययनसंप्रदायं द्वेधा व्यवस्थापयामासुः। शिरोमणिप्रस्थानपरिष्करणद्वारा दाक्षिणभारते शास्त्राध्ययनसंप्रदायं नवीकृतवन्तः। प्राचीनपठनपाठनसंप्रदाये विरलप्रचाराणाम् अथवा लुप्तप्रचाराणां शाबरभाष्य-पञ्चपादिकाविवरण - कुसुमाञ्जलि-ध्वन्यालोक-लोचनप्रभृतीनां प्राचीनानां प्रौढतमानां ग्रन्थरत्नानां विमर्शपुरस्सरमध्ययनमध्यापनं च प्रवर्तयामासुः। आनर्स्कक्ष्याधीतिनां यथा पूर्वतोऽप्यधिकतर शास्त्रार्थपरिज्ञानं स्यात्तथा तत्पाठान् व्यवस्थापयामासुः। किं चातिगहनानां तत्तच्छास्त्राणामतिदुरूहांस्तत्त्वार्थान् जिज्ञासतामुपकाराय शास्त्रिवर्यास्तत्तच्छास्त्रे तत्तद्विषये सुचिरं सविशेषकृतविमर्शान् परिणतमतीन् पण्डिताग्रेसरान् विश्वविद्यालयकार्यनिर्वाहकसभा (Syndicate) धिकारिभ्यो निवेद्य तत्र तत्र विद्यास्थाने तैस्तैर्विपश्चिद्भिस्तांस्तान् विषयानधिकृत्य सुविशदवाङ्मयरूपाणि व्याख्यानानि (Extension Lectures) प्रावर्तयन्। स्वयं चाध्यात्मशास्त्रे, प्रमाणशास्त्रे, साहित्यविद्यायां च बहून् विषयानधिकृत्य नानाविद्यास्थानेषु तादृशानि वाङ्मयानि व्यरचयन्। शास्त्रिवर्याणां वाङ्मयानि व्याख्यानानि सर्वाण्यपि विषयबहुलानि बह्वर्थप्रमापकाणि सावधानेन मनसा तान्युपशृण्वतां तदर्थान् परिभावयतां च सुतरां व्युत्पादकानि च। बहवस्तच्छिष्याः तादृशेषु व्याख्यानेषु तैरुपक्षिप्तानेवार्थानादाय तदुपदर्शितरीत्या सोपबृंहणं तानर्थान् परिपोष्य खण्डकृतीरपि निर्मितवन्तः। इत्थमस्याः सभायाः (Board of Studies) अतिगुर्वीमाध्यक्ष्यधुरं पञ्चत्रिंशद्वत्सरपरिमितमतिमहान्तं कालमूढवद्भिरेभिर्यथोचितं यथावसरं च गैर्वाण्यभिवृद्धये बहूपकृतम्। एवं संस्कृतपरीक्षकसमाजस्याप्याध्यक्ष्यं सुचिरं कालं निर्वहन्तः प्रश्नपत्रिकासंपादनपरिपाटीमपि परिष्कुर्वन्ति स्म। यदेते सुचिरं कालं अनयोरुभयोः सभयोः (Board of Studies and Examiners) निस्सपत्नतयाध्यक्ष्यमवहन् तदिदमेकमेव निदर्शनं तदीयं सर्वतोमुखं वैदुष्यमाविष्कर्तुमलम्। अन्यच्च यदा एते परीक्षकसमाजे स्थानमवहंस्तदा नानाशास्त्रपरीक्षकाणामप्येक एव समाजोऽभूत् यत्र शास्त्रिवर्या एवाध्यक्ष्यमवहन्। यस्मिन्नेव वत्सरे एते तत्समाजादुपरत-

व्यापारा अभूवंस्तस्मिन्नेव वत्सरे स समाजो नानाशाखतया विभिन्नः प्रतिशाखं च तदा तदा भिन्नभिन्नोऽध्यक्षो नियोजनीयोऽभूत् ॥

अत्रान्तरे शास्त्रिवर्याणां विविधं कौशलमुपश्रुत्य श्रीमत्पञ्चनदप्रतिष्ठापितराजकीय-संस्कृतविद्यालयाधिकारिणः स्वकलाशालापरिष्करणाय शास्त्रिवर्याणां सन्निधानं तत्रापेक्षन्ते स्म । ते च तत्कलाशालाध्यक्ष्यमङ्गीकृत्य तत्र न्यायमीमांसयोर्व्याकरणालङ्कारयोश्च शास्त्रयोः शिरोमणिकक्ष्यां प्रतिष्ठाप्य विशिष्टानधिकारिणस्तत्तत्कक्ष्यासु प्रवेश्य सर्वेष्वपि विषयेषु विद्यार्थिनां पूर्वतोऽप्यधिकतरं सौकर्यातिशयमाहितवन्तः ॥

एवं पञ्चनदविद्यालये नानाप्रकारेण गैर्वाणीपरिचरणमाचरत्सु शास्त्रिवर्येषु उपरितनकक्ष्यामारुह्य शास्त्रिवर्याणां निकटेऽध्येतुं कुतूहलवतामस्मादृशानामधस्तन-कक्ष्यागतानां माणवकानां भागधेयवैषम्याद्, अथवा संस्कृतप्रणयिनो लोकस्य भागधेयातिशयवशान् मद्रनगरीविराजमानमद्रमण्डलप्रधानविद्यालये (Presidency College) संस्कृतप्रधानाध्यापकपदवीमलङ्कर्तुं शास्त्रिमहाभागा मद्रमण्डलाधीश्वरै-राहूताः । शास्त्रिमहाशयाश्च तां पदवीमलमकुर्वन् न केवलमिदं स्थानमात्मनोऽ-भ्युदयाय महते श्रेयसे च भविष्यतीति धिया ; परं तु तत्र स्थितस्यात्मनो गैर्वाणी-परिचरणाय तदुपासकानां साहाय्याचरणाय च भूयानवकाशो भविष्यतीति बुद्ध्यापि । तत्पदमारूढाश्च वर्णलिङ्गपरिच्छेदमनाकलयन्तो बहूंश्छात्रानध्यापयमासुः । तेषां मध्ये बहवस्तत्र तत्र विश्वविद्यालयेषु संस्कृतकलाशालासु आङ्ग्लकलाशालासु चाध्यक्ष्यमतिमहितामध्यापकपदवीं वा वहन्तः शास्त्रिवर्योपज्ञं विद्यासंप्रदायं प्रवर्तयन्ति । मद्रमण्डलस्थसंस्कृतपाठशालाप्रत्यवेक्षकपदवी बहोः कालादारभ्य क्रमेण तच्छिष्यैरे-वालङ्क्रियते ॥

एवं विबुधवरान् शिष्यान् प्रशिष्यांश्च बहूनुत्पादितवतां शास्त्रिवर्याणां यथा वदर्हणां कर्तुमभीप्सन्तो राजकीयाधिकारिवर्या महामहोपाध्यायविरुदेनैतानभूषय-न्निति नैतत्सन्तोषास्पदं यतस्तच्छिष्यास्तद्विरुदालङ्कृता दिगन्तेषु विराजन्ते । परं त्विदमत्र श्लाघास्पदं यदस्मिन् जनपदे संस्कृताध्यापकान्तरेणाननुभूतां महनीयां प्राच्यविद्याविनेतृपदवीं (I.E.S) इमानारोप्य यथावदपूजयन्निति ॥

शास्त्रिवर्याश्चैते मद्रविश्वविद्यालयमन्त्रिसभायां (Senate) विद्वत्सभायां च (Academic Council) स्थानमवलम्ब्य गैर्वाणीसंवर्धनाय बहुधोपकृत्य स्वोद्यमेन मद्रविश्वविद्यालये प्राच्यविद्याविमर्शनशालायां (Oriental Research Institute) संस्कृतस्यानपायं स्थानं प्रकल्प्य विमर्शनानिपुणान् स्वच्छात्रांस्तत्र विमर्शनाधिकारे प्रतिष्ठाप्य बहून्यदृष्टचराणि ग्रन्थरत्नानि प्रकाशयामासुः । अन्येषु च विद्यास्थानेषु महनीयं स्थानमधितिष्ठद्भिस्तच्छात्रैर्भूयांसो ग्रन्थाः प्रकाशिताः प्रकाश्यन्ते च । यथा वङ्गधरायां विराजमानैर्महामहोपाध्यायानन्तकृष्णशास्त्रिवर्यैः असङ्ख्यानामति-प्रौढानां ग्रन्थरत्नानां प्रकाशनेन केषाञ्चिद्व्याख्याकरणेन चाद्वैतशास्त्राभिवृद्धये सुबहूप-

कृतमिति कस्य वा न विदितम् । अन्ये च शास्त्रिवर्याणामन्तेवासिनस्तैरुपदिष्टानर्थान् क्रोडीकृत्य सप्रपञ्चं ग्रन्थरूपेण विवृत्य तत्त्वविद्यानिपुणः (Ph.D.) इति विरुदं चाधिगतवन्तः । इत्थं स्वयं द्वित्रान् निर्माय स्वशिष्यद्वारा अतिप्रौढान् बहून् ग्रन्थान् प्रकाशितवतः शास्त्रिवर्यानाधिकृत्य बहुशैरप्येतैर्ग्रन्थनिर्माणेन लोकस्य नोपकृतमिति दोषोद्घाटनं न समञ्जसमेव । भाषातत्त्वशास्त्रं (Philology) भारतीयप्रमाणतत्त्वशास्त्रं च (Indian Epistemology) अधिकृत्यातिविस्तृतो ग्रन्थो विरचनीय इति सुमहान् मनोरथोऽभूच्छास्त्रिमहाशयनाम् । परं तु शिष्याणामतिगहनदुरूहशास्त्रतत्त्वार्थाध्यापनेन तद्द्वारा नानादिक्षु शास्त्रसंप्रदायप्रवर्तनेन च सुमहानुपकारो लोकस्य संपत्स्यत इति धिया कृत्स्नमायुः प्रवचनेनैव क्षपितवतां तेषां मनोरथं सफलयितुमवकाशः पर्याप्तो नाभूत् ॥

अपि च पौरस्त्यविद्यातत्त्वार्थविचारपत्रिका (Journal of Oriental Research) इति या पत्रिका मद्रनगरीतः प्रकाश्यते यत्र विबुधवर्यैरैतिहासिकाः शास्त्रीयाश्च विषया विमृश्यन्ते तस्याः पत्रिकायाः, या च मद्रनगरे संस्कृतसेवासमितिरिति (Sanskrit Academy) सभा विराजते यस्यां रसिकाग्रेसरैर्वाल्मीकिव्यासकालिदासप्रभृतीनां महाकवीनां प्रबन्धरत्नानि परिशील्यन्ते तद्रसश्चास्वाद्यते तस्याः परिषदश्च जीवितप्रदाः शास्त्रिवर्या इति सुविदितमिदम् ॥

अतिगहनविषमग्रन्थानां पाठशोधनं समीचीनपाठव्यवस्थापने च शास्त्रिवर्याणामतिमहत् कौतूहलम् । तथा कुतूहलवतां विमर्शकानां महते सौकर्याय शास्त्रिवर्या अधिकारिणामानुकूल्यं संपाद्य नानादेशेभ्यस्तालपत्रादिमयान् हस्तलिखितान् बहून् ग्रन्थान् समाहृत्य मद्रनगरे प्रतिष्ठाप्य तस्याः प्राचीनविद्यामातृकाग्रन्थशालायाः स्वयमेव पर्यवेक्षका (Curator) अभूवन् ॥

इत्थं गैर्वाणीपरिचरणेनैव पूर्णमायुर्नीत्वा चरमे वयसि विश्रमाकाङ्क्षया तत्तदधिकारपदवीतो विरतव्यापारानेतान् दक्षिणभारते विश्वविद्यालयप्रतिष्ठापनेन विद्याभिवृद्धयेऽव्याजमुपकृतवन्तो **राजा अण्णामलै श्रेष्ठिवर्याः** तद्विश्वविद्यालयाध्यक्षा दिगन्तविश्रान्तयशसः सात्त्विकत्यागिनामग्रेसराः **रैट् आनरबिल् श्रीनिवासशास्त्रिमहाशयाश्च** स्वविश्वविद्यालये संस्कृतविभागाध्यक्ष्यालङ्करणाय प्रार्थयामासुः । अस्मच्छास्त्रिमहाशयाश्च पुनरपि नैसर्गिकेण गैर्वाणीसेवनकौतुकेन प्रचोदितास्तां पदवीमङ्गीकृत्य विश्वविद्यालाध्यक्षशास्त्रिवर्यवत् स्वयमपि विश्वविद्यालयात् प्रत्युपकारमनपेक्षमाणा (Honorary) वर्षचतुष्टयमत्र दैवीवाक्परिचरणमन्वातिष्ठन् ॥

इत्थं यावदायुष्यं दैवीं वाचमुपास्य भौतिकं देहं परित्यज्येदानीं ब्रह्मभूयं प्राप्ता दोषासंस्पृष्टगुणगणनिलयाः महानुभावा आचार्यपादा सर्वात्मनेमं जनमनुगृह्णीयुरिति प्रार्थयमाण एव विरमत्ययं जनः ॥

SRI K. L. VYASARAYA SASTRI, Sanskrit Dept., Presidency College, Madras:—

अस्त्यग्राहारप्रवरो लक्ष्मीजन्ममनोहरः ।
गणपत्यग्रहाराख्यो विद्वद्रात्नाकरः परः ॥ १

तस्मिन् कुवलयानन्दं वितन्वन् द्विजतल्लजः ।
श्रीमान् कुप्पुस्वामिशास्त्री कलावानुदयं गतः ॥ २

कवेरजातीरभुवि स्थितोऽसौ तञ्जापुरोपान्तगतोऽग्रहारः ।
मन्ये दिवः सद्युति खण्डमेकं यस्माद्बुधोऽसावजनिष्ट तत्र ॥ ३

* अग्रे नृत्यन्नग्रहारस्य तस्य केकी कश्चित् प्रौढकेकाच्छलेन ।
विद्वांसः के का विदुष्यश्च लोके नैनं नन्दन्तीति पृच्छन्निवासीत् ॥ ४

सोऽयं सम्प्रत्यात्तशोकातिभार-
स्त्यक्त्वा नृत्यं शास्त्रिवर्यप्रवासात् ।
विद्वांसः के का विदुष्यश्च लोके
नैनं शोचन्तीति पृच्छन्निवाह ॥ ५

नानाशास्त्रप्रवीणः परिणतधिषणः कोविदः क्रान्तदर्शी
श्रीकुप्पुस्वामिशास्त्री जनिमिह गणपत्यग्रहारेऽधिगम्य ।
बाल्यात्सम्पाद्य लौल्यातिशयपटुतां हूणगीर्वाणवाण्योः
प्राप्तो लोके प्रतिष्ठां विशदनिजयशःशोभिताखण्डदेशः ॥ ६

पौरस्त्यपाश्चात्यनयद्वयज्ञः पुरोऽपि पश्चादपि माननीयः ।
यः सूक्तिमुक्ताफलवारिराशिः परं व्यराजत् सुगृहीतनामा ॥ ७

सर्वेषु शास्त्रेषु कृतावगाहः साहित्यमार्गेऽप्यतुलप्रभावः ।
विद्वज्जनानां गणनाप्रसङ्गे कनिष्ठिकामङ्गुलिमध्यतिष्ठत् ॥ ८

विद्यामुपादाय विनीतभावो दोषज्ञसंश्लाघितसत्प्रभावः ।
वाग्देवतोपासनमात्मधर्ममंमंस्त मीमांसकपुङ्गवोऽसौ ॥ ९

श्रीमद्रपत्तनगते महिलापुरेऽसौ
कालं च कञ्चिदथ पञ्चनदे प्रसिद्धे ।
अध्यास्य संस्कृतकलालयमुख्यपीठं
वाग्देवताहृदयमुल्लसितं व्यधत्त ॥ १०

* For a long time there used to be a peacock moving about at the entrance to the Ganapati Agrahara.

पश्चात् स मद्रनगरस्थितराजकीय-
विद्यालये नियमितो नियतेर्नियोगात् ।
गीर्वाणवाक्प्रवचनाधिकृतो व्यराज-
द्भास्वानिव प्रकटितोज्ज्वलगोसहस्रः ॥ ११

श्रेयांसि शिष्यनिवहस्य हृदाभिकाङ्क्षन्
ग्रन्थारविन्दनिचयेषु चरन् प्रमोदात् ।
सङ्गृह्य पाठ्यविषयान् मधुलिट्सरण्या
शिष्यानसिञ्चत वचोमधुधारयासौ ॥ १२

पुराणमित्येव न साधु सर्वं नवीनमित्येव न चाप्यवद्यम् ।
इत्यास्थितः शिक्षणमार्गदर्शी प्रत्नं च नूत्नं च स बह्वमंस्त ॥ १३

विद्यावाचस्पतिरयमभूत् सम्भृताशेषविद्यः
शिक्षादक्षः कुलपतिरभूत् पाठयन् शिष्यवर्गान् ।
तस्मिन्नित्थं बिरुदमखिलं मान्यमन्यैर्वितीर्णं
सार्थं भूत्वा व्यलसदतुलं लोकमान्यप्रकर्षे ॥ १४

महामहोपाध्यायत्वमास्थितस्य कलालये ।
महामहोपाध्यायत्वमगमत्पुनरुक्तताम् ॥ १५

शब्दार्थभावनापूर्वकल्पनाभिर्विभूषिताः ।
तद्वाचस्तमवोचन्त प्राज्ञं मीमांसकं गुरुम् ॥ १६

नासौ परीहासकृतेऽपि गोष्ठ्यां कदाप्यवादीदविमृश्य किञ्चित् ।
ग्रैवेयके वज्रवदस्य वाक्ये पदान्यशोभन्त सदोज्ज्वलानि ॥ १७

अन्तर्वाणिरयं भयेन रहितश्चर्चासु सक्तः सुधी-
रन्येषां वचनान्यनन्यवशगो निष्पक्षपातं क्षिपन् ।
यद्यत् सर्वकलालयेऽत्र कृतवान् विद्याभिवृद्धेः कृते
तत्सर्वं विवृणोति तस्य महतीं वाचस्पतित्वप्रथाम् ॥ १८

विद्वच्छिरोमणिमुखा विविधाः परीक्षाः श्रीमद्रमण्डलसमस्तकलालयेऽसौ ।
भूरिश्रमेण परिकल्प्य महाप्रभावो गीर्वाणवाचमुचितां पदवीमनैषीत् ॥ १९

---

११. प्रकटितोज्ज्वलगोसहस्रः=अत्र गोशब्दस्य वाक् किरणश्चार्थः ॥

१६. शब्दार्थभावना=शाब्दी आर्थी च भावना, अपूर्वकल्पना=अदृष्टकल्पनेति मीमांसकपक्षे, शब्दार्थयोर्भावना अभिनवकल्पना चेति प्रकृते, मीमांसकः=मीमांसाशास्त्र-तर्कः विचारदक्षश्च ॥ गुरुः=तन्नामको मीमांसाशास्त्रप्रवर्तकः आचार्यश्च ॥

१७. ग्रैवेयकम्=कण्ठभूषा । १८. अन्तर्वाणिस्तु शास्त्रवित् ।

मर्त्येष्वमर्त्यवचसः परिपोषणार्थे
बद्धादरेण यदकारि विदां वरेण ।
तस्यास्ति किं नु सदृशं सुकृतं जगत्यां
येनैष यास्यति भुवीव दिवि प्रकर्षम् ॥ २०

नक्तन्दिवं स्वप्नमसौ विहाय विद्याभिवृद्ध्यै विदधत प्रयत्नम् ।
अस्वप्नभावं परलोकलभ्यमत्रैव सम्पादितवान् बुधाग्रयः ॥ २१

'आकारसदृशप्रज्ञः प्रज्ञया सदृशागमः ।
आगमैः सदृशारम्भ आरम्भसदृशोदयः ॥'

इत्यस्याः कालिदासोक्तेरुदाहरणतां गतः ।
श्रीकुप्पुस्वामिशास्त्रीव विरलस्तादृशो जनः ॥ २२

उद्योगाद्विरतो विपश्चिधिषणः सप्रश्रयं प्रार्थितः
स्वीयं क्लेशमनल्पमप्यगणयन् नित्यं परार्थे रतः ।
कालं कञ्चिदसौ चिदम्बरपुरालङ्कारभूयं गते
ख्याते सर्वकलालयेऽलमकरोद्गीर्वाणवाणीपदम् ॥ २३

यदीयं वैदुष्यं विततमतलस्पर्शि नितरां
परोक्षेऽप्यश्लाघि श्लथितनिजमानैर्बुधजनैः ।
स कुप्पुस्वाम्यार्यो महितहितकार्याहितमति-
र्हृता लोकादस्मादहह विधिना क्रूरमतिना । २४

मीमांसा सहसा विचारकुशलाप्यन्यामवस्थां गता
वेदान्तोऽन्यकृतान्तवारणपटुर्जातः स्वयं तद्वशः ।
माता संस्कृतभारतीह विलपत्यन्योऽदेशक्षमा
शास्त्रिण्यद्य दिवं गते भुवमिमामालेढि शोको महान् ॥ २५

शरदिजपरिपूर्णग्लौसहस्रावदातं
दिशि दिशि परिकीर्य स्वं यशः शास्त्रिवर्यः ।
त्रिदशभुवनमद्य द्योतयन्नात्मभासा
झटिति भुवमपास्यन् भूसुरोऽगात् सुरत्वम् ॥ २६

---

२०. मर्त्येष्वमर्त्यवचसः परिपोषणेन मर्त्यामर्त्यलोकयोः समुत्कर्षः समुचित एवेति भावः ।

२१. अस्वप्नभावः = स्वप्नराहितत्वं देवत्वं च । बुधाग्रयः = विद्वच्छ्रेष्ठः सुरश्रेष्ठश्च ।

२५. कृतान्तः सिद्धान्तो यमश्च । तद्वशः कृतान्तवशः यमाधीन इत्यर्थः ॥

२६. ग्लौः = चन्द्रः । भूसुर इत्यत्र भू इत्यस्यांशस्य त्यागे सुर इत्यंशोऽवशिष्यत इत्यपि द्रष्टव्यम् ।

स्वीयं शरीरं जरसावलीढं समीक्ष्य तस्याः प्रतिकारमिच्छुः ।
मन्ये बुधो निर्जरतामुपार्जत स्वकर्मभिः शर्मविधानदक्षैः ॥ २७

लोकं समस्तं महसा निजेन प्रकाश्य नित्यं बुधवर्त्मचारी ।
स्वशिष्यदीपेषु निधाय भासं भासां निधिर्नेत्रपथान्निलीनः ॥ २८

स्थित्वा चिरं संस्कृतकल्पवृक्षे पीत्वा च तत्त्वामृतमा स्वतृप्तेः ।
द्विजोत्तमोऽनुत्तमपक्षपाती विहर्तुमिच्छन्नुदपतदभ्रम् ॥ २९

इत्थं केकी लब्धवर्णं द्विजाग्र्यं
दृष्ट्वोड्डीनं संस्कृतोर्वीरुहाग्रात् ।
पश्यन् सर्वं लोकमालोकहीनं
श्लोकव्याजादुज्जगार स्वशोकम् ॥ ३०

SRI V. H. SUBRAHMANYA SASTRI, Madras Sanskrit College:—

विद्यावाचस्पतिरिति बुधैः श्लाघितो यस्तदर्हः
शिष्योच्छ्रायात् कुलपतिरिति ख्यापितः संयमीन्द्रैः ।
प्रापत् प्राज्यां परमपदवीं सत्वरः पण्डितेन्द्रः
दौर्भाग्यान्नः कुशलविमुखात् कारणं नान्यदीक्षे ॥

प्रज्ञा प्राज्ञैरभिमतगुणा निर्मलः संप्रबोधो
वृत्तं चित्तप्रशमनपरं तत्त्वनिष्ठा च चर्चा ।
नैकत्रायं गुणसमुदयः शास्त्रिणोऽन्यत्र लभ्यः
इत्येवान्तर्भ्रजति नितरां स्वान्तमश्रान्ततापम् ॥

पाण्डित्यं विनयोज्ज्वलं परिगतां मेधामसाधारणीं
धैर्यं धीरसमादृतं धृतगुणां सर्वंकषां शेमुषीम् ।
श्रीमान् शास्त्रिमहोदयो ह्यविमृशन् नः शोचनीयां दशां
स्वेनैवानयदित्ययं हि विषयः कोपाय नो भूयसे ॥

माधुर्यधुर्यभणितिं महनीयभावां
मन्दक्रमां मदयुतां महिलामिवेड्याम् ।
श्रीशास्त्रिणः सरलसंस्कृतवाङ्मुखेषु
के वा भवन्न विवशाः परिसेवमानः ॥

२७ निर्जरत्वम्=जराराहितत्वं देवत्वं च ।
२८. बुधवर्त्म=विद्वन्मार्गः सुरवर्त्म च । भासां निधिः=तेजोराशिः सूर्यश्च ।
२९. द्विजोत्तमः=ब्राह्मणश्रेष्ठः पक्षिश्रेष्ठश्च ।
३०. द्विजाग्र्यः=ब्राह्मणश्रेष्ठः पक्षिश्रेष्ठश्च ।

प्राच्यां विद्यां कुलधनधिया गौरवादध्यगीष्ट
पाश्चात्यामप्यखिलजनताबोधनायाध्यगच्छत् ।
प्राच्यावाच्योरपि समुदयः शास्त्रिवर्ये सरण्यो-
स्तुल्यो गङ्गातपनजनुषोर्भारताप्लावनाय ॥

श्रीमान् शास्त्रिमहोदयः स्वसुकृतैर्वैराजलोकं गतः
श्रुयन्तेडिततत्त्वमद्भुतरसं व्याख्यातु तत्संसदि ।
तत्रत्यान् परितोषयत्वविरतं का नोऽस्ति हानिस्ततः-
श्चास्मास्वार्द्रमनाः सदा प्रभवतादित्येव नः प्रार्थना ॥

THE PRINCIPAL AND STAFF OF THE MAHARAJAH'S SANSKRIT COLLEGE, VIZIANAGARAM:—

तत्रभवतां विद्यावाचस्पतीनां महामहोपाध्यायविरुदाङ्कितानां पण्डितकुलपतीनां से. कुप्पुस्वामिशास्त्रिमहाशयानामवतारसमाप्तिर्न केवलं दाक्षिणात्यानामेव, अपि तु सर्वेषामपि भरतखण्डनिवासिनां पण्डितप्रवराणामनल्पाय खेदाय कल्पत इतीदमवितथं वचः ॥

सकलविद्वज्जनसंस्तूयमानप्रतिभाविशेषाणां सहृदयानां श्रीशास्त्रिवर्याणां गुणैकदेशप्रशंसनमपि यत्किञ्चिनकथनं स्यात्, किं पुनस्समग्रगुवर्णनम्! अथापि महापुरुषगुणकीर्तनमल्पमपि महतेऽभ्युदयाय कल्पत इति विश्वसन्तो वयमत्र प्रवर्तामहे ॥

श्रीशास्त्रिमहाशयाः सकलदुरितौघावेध्वंसनपटीयस्या नयनानन्ददायिन्याः कावेर्यास्तटे शिष्टजनसंकलिते गणपत्यग्रहारे सुप्रसिद्धे कस्मिन् श्रोत्रियब्राह्मणकुले स्वजनुषालङ्कृत्य कालानुरोधेन राजकीयामाङ्लभाषामधीयाना अपि गीर्वाणभाषासमादरेण बाल्य एव वयस्यधीतसंस्कृतकाव्यनाटकादिग्रन्था वैदिकधर्मजिज्ञासया पूर्वमीमांसाशास्त्रमपि विरामदिवसेषु साकल्येन सुप्रसिद्धेभ्यः पण्डितप्रवरेभ्योऽधिगत्य सममेवोभयविद्यापारङ्गताः समभूवन्नित्यपरोक्षमेतत् । न केवलं कर्ममीमांसायामेव, अपि तु न्यायवैशेषिकयोरुत्तरमीमांसायां शब्दशास्त्रे चाधिकतरं कृतपरिश्रमाः सर्वतन्त्रस्वतन्त्रा इति प्रसिद्धिमुपगता व्यराजन्तेति नेयमतिशयोक्तिः ॥

विद्वद्वतंसा एते स्वप्रतिभाविशेषेणाङ्ग्लभाषायां एम्. ए. परीक्षायामुत्तीर्णाः क्रमेण मद्रपुरीस्थराजकीयोन्नताङ्ग्लकलाशालायां संस्कृतभाषाप्रधानाध्यापकपदवमिलंकृत्य स्वोपदेशपाटवेन बहूंश्छात्रवर्यान् एम्. ए. परीक्षायामुत्तार्यात्मसदृशानकार्षुरिति सुविदितमेतत् ॥

किं च तत्र कलाशालायां संस्कृतशाखोच्छेदाय बद्धपरिकरेषु केषुचिदेते शास्त्रिवर्याः स्वबुद्धिकौशलेन तस्मादुपद्रवादभिरक्ष्य तां शाखां सुविरूढमूलां कृत्वा संस्कृतभाषाभिमानिनां चिरसंस्मरणीया अभूवन्नित्यत्र न कोऽपि विशयः ॥

अपि च पण्डितवरेण्या एते प्राच्यविद्यासमुद्धरणबद्धदीक्षा मद्रपुरीविश्वकलापरिषदि प्राच्यविद्यापरीक्षाः संस्थाप्य तास्वितःपूर्वं पठनपाठनेषु विलुप्तप्रायान सुप्रसिद्धान् बहून् शास्त्रग्रन्थान् पाठ्यतया नियोज्य बहूपाकुर्वन् संस्कृतवाङ्मयस्येति न रिक्तं वचः ॥

अपरं च सलोचनं ध्वन्यालोकं सुसूक्ष्मया दृशा सम्यक् संशोध्य विद्वज्जनमनोरञ्जन्या कौमुद्याख्यया व्याख्यया स्वोपज्ञेनोपलोचनेन च सह प्रकटय्यापारं लोकोपकारमारचयन्तः सकलविद्वज्जनसंस्मरणीयचरिता आसन्नित्यत्र विद्वज्जन एव प्रमाणम् ॥

अन्यच्च एते व्यावहारिकभाषायामिव संस्कृतभाषायामपेक्षितविषयेषु मृदुमधुरया शैल्या निरर्गलया धारयोपन्यस्यन्तः स्वीयगीर्वाणभाषास्वातन्त्र्यमावेद्य कस्य वा विस्मयं नाजनयन् ॥

अपि च मद्रपुरीविश्वकलापरिषत्संबन्धिन्याः संस्कृतपाठ्यग्रन्थनिर्णायकसभायाः परीक्षकसङ्घस्य च सुचिरमध्यक्षपदवीमलंकृत्य तत्कार्यजातं सक्रमं निरवर्तयन्नेते शास्त्रिवर्या इत्यकथितोऽपि ज्ञायत एव विद्वल्लोकेन ॥

किं च मद्रपुरीस्थराजकीयकलाशालायामध्यापकपदमुत्सृज्य विश्रान्तिसुखमनुभवन्तः श्रीशास्त्रिवर्याः, आत्मनोऽपूर्वां बोधकतासरणिं सर्वतन्त्रस्वातन्त्र्यं चाकलयद्भिरण्णामलैविश्वकलापरिषदध्यक्षैः सादरमाकारिताः, वार्धकेऽपि स्वकीयं क्लेशमनादृत्य विद्याव्याख्यानेन केवलं लोकोपकारबद्धदीक्षाः तत्र गत्वा स्वीयामुपदेशचातुरीं सर्वकलावैदुष्यं च प्रकटय्य तदीयविश्वविद्यालयावद्यार्थिधन्यवादास्पदाः समभूवन्नित्यति प्रसिद्धमेतत् ॥

अपि चाभ्यस्ताङ्ग्लविद्या अपि श्रीशास्त्रितल्लजा वैदिकधर्मनिरताः श्रौतस्मार्तकर्माणि यथाकलं यथाविध्यनुतिष्ठन्तो लोकादर्शभूता पवित्रजीविता व्यराजन्तेति सविस्मयं निवेदयन्तो वयं कृतार्था अभूम ॥ इति शम् ॥

Dr. A. N. NARASIMHIA, M.A. L.T., PH.D. (London), Principal, Maharaja's Sanskrit College, Mysore:—

हा हन्त वितथोऽयमाभाणकः य एष "सङ्घे शक्तिः कलौ युगे" इति। यत्कारणं विधिरेवेह दुष्टो बलीयानभवत्, य आदत्त निर्घृणस्तथाविधानपि कुप्पुस्वामिशास्त्रिण इति सुगृहीतनामधेयान् पण्डितकुलपतीन्, येऽलौकिकमाहिमभाजः सर्वतन्त्रस्वतन्त्राः। न पुनश्शाब्दिकसङ्घः, न वा नैयायिकसमूहः, नैव चोभयमीमांसकपूगः, नव्यं च साहित्यरत्नाकरनिधिमग्नहृदयसहृदयगणो भूमावेवेमान् स्थापयितुं प्राभवत्। कतमो वै तत्सङ्घावयवभूतस्तत्तत्तन्त्रमार्मिकाणाममीषां विद्वन्मणीनां वियोगं सहेत

यो योऽवासैतत्पण्डितरत्नपरिचयः, अपि त्वाशासीरन्नेवंदक्षपण्डितप्रकाण्डानां सार्वकालिकीं सर्वथा कल्याणसन्ततिं सर्वे, श्रुतमात्रे चैतेषां शुभेतरलेशेऽवतिष्ठेरन्नशनिहतस्थायम्। तदिहेममाभाणकमन्यथयन् दुर्विधिरसंशयं शाब्दिकानां मर्माणि प्राहरत्, नैयायिकसौभाग्यममर्दयत्, मीमांसकदर्पमदलयत्, साहित्यार्णवमग्नसहृदयहृदयमस्फोटयत् इति सुस्पष्टम्। अमी हि पण्डितवर्या असदृशशेमुषीका आलस्यगन्धेनाप्यस्पृष्टा आङ्ग्लविद्यालयं प्रवेशिता अपि तादृशविद्याभ्यासमाविरुन्धाना एव आबाल्यात् यथाशिष्टसंप्रदायं साहित्यशब्दन्यायोभयमीमांसावरिष्ठेभ्योऽधिगततत्तत्तन्त्राः, लब्ध M. A. बिरुदाः मद्रास् - पञ्चनदसंस्कृतमहापाठशालाध्यक्षभूतास्ततो बहुतिथेषु कालेषु Presidency College संस्कृतप्रधानाध्यापकाः सन्तोऽजस्रतत्तत्तन्त्रार्थविमर्शनैकजीवातवः कति कति वा विधेयसङ्घान् न कृतार्थ्यकुर्वन्? कति कति वा लुप्तप्रचारान् अशुद्धिभूयिष्ठांस्तन्त्रग्रन्थान् संशोध्य न प्राकाशयन्? हा हन्त! इतोऽपि यद्येते भुवमेवालमकरिष्यन्, कति कति वेदृशानि कल्याणानि नातानिष्यन् प्रारब्धरचनांश्च कुतूहलवृत्तिसारसंग्रहादिग्रन्थान् न समापयिष्यन्॥

यत्सत्यं सर्वथा अपार्थेयं वसुन्धरा, यासावीदृक्षममूल्यं वसु जहत्येवास्ते न धरन्ती॥

Sri Narayana Sastri Khiste, Principal, Sanskrit College and Sarasvati Bhavan, Benares:—

जगन्ति यः कलयते घासग्रासमजो यथा।
कालाय दुर्निवाराय तस्मै नित्यं नमो नमः॥

हा! हन्ताद्य निशम्य दुःसहतरं शम्पानिपातोपमं
कुप्पुस्वामिमनीषिणः सुरपुरप्रस्थानमाकस्मिकम्।
चित्तं खिद्यति तादृशाद्भुतमहापाण्डित्यलीलां पुन-
र्द्रष्टुं नैव यतो वयं हतविधेः शक्ष्यामहे जातुचित्॥ १

कुप्पुस्वामिमहीगुरोरतुलितां पौरस्त्यपाश्चात्यदिग्-
जेत्रीं शास्त्रपयोधिमाथनवनीतास्वादिनीं शेमुषीम्।
स्तोतुं कः क्षमतामशेषवसुधालङ्कारहीरायितां
कीर्त्युल्लासितदिग्वधूसुवदनाम्भोजाभशेषः कृती॥ २

साङ्गोपाङ्गपदक्रमोपनिषदो वेदांश्च पूर्वोत्तरे
मीमांसे कणभुङ्नयं च चरणाक्षस्यापि सद्दर्शनम्।
योऽध्याप्य स्वसमान् दिगन्तविचरत्कीर्तीननन्तान् विदः
शिष्यान् स्वान्निरपीपदत् सयशसा जागर्ति विद्वत्तमः॥ ३

नानाशास्त्रगभीरतत्त्वविशदीकारप्रकारोत्तराँ-
ल्लेखान् यः समलीलिखत् सुरगिरा पाश्चात्यवाचापि वा ।
लुप्तप्रायसुदुर्लभामितमहाग्रन्थौघसम्पादकोऽ-
प्यासीद्यो भुवि निस्तुलः स सुयशःशेषोऽद्य हा स्मर्यते ॥ ४

आशैशवादधिगताखिलवेदमौलिभागानुशीलनविनिर्मलचित्तवृत्तेः ।
तस्येश्वरेण सकरुणेन सरूपता तु वीर्यार्जितैव न च सास्ति मुधार्थनीया ॥ ५

PROF. SIVA PRASAD BHATTACHARYA, Calcutta University, Calcutta :—

स्वनामधन्य ! शास्त्रार्थचिन्तमणिभृतां वर ।
प्रियवेङ्कटराजात्तराघवादृतशङ्कर ॥ १

वाङ्मनःकायसिद्धं ते मीमांसकशिरोमणे ।
स्मरामि चाद्वयोद्देशं प्रत्नवर्त्मानुपालने ॥ २

असौ सुधर्माभरणो मनीषी गुरुः पुराध्यापकचक्रवर्ती ।
चकास्ति शास्त्रशकुलानधीशीकृतान् स्वशक्त्या धृतबोधवर्तिः ॥ ३

विद्या विवादाय पदं मदाय शीलं जनानां जनवञ्चनाय ।
मान्यस्य ते तद्विपरीतमासीद्दानाय पुण्याय च देशनाय ॥ ४

ज्ञानामृताय विभवे नवसम्प्रदायशास्त्रे शुभाय सफलोत्तरसाधकाय ।
आचार्यवर्य ! पट्टकूटजुषां समस्यासम्पूरिणोऽस्तु कृतिने बत ते नमस्या ॥ ५

ACHARYA KSHITI MOHAN SEN, VISVABHARATI, Santiniketan :—

सुप्रसिद्धपण्डितप्रवरा महामहोपाध्यायाः कुप्पुस्वामिशास्त्रिपादा भौतदेहं विहाय लोकान्तरं गता इति भारतीयानां सुमहती क्षतिः । शास्त्रेषु गम्भीरप्रज्ञावतां पण्डितानां परिणतेऽपि काले वियोगेन तदासनम् अपूर्णमेव स्यादिति प्रायो दृश्यते । तेन च तादृशकृतान्तविलसितेन कालेऽपि अकालवियोगव्यथा क्लिश्नातितराम् । गुरुपरम्परालब्धशेमुषी तस्या गाम्भीर्यं च प्राचीनेष्वेव केषुचित् सुधीवर्येषु यथा दृश्यते न तथा आधुनिकेष्विति अप्रियमपि सत्यमेव । लोकान्तरितपण्डितप्रकाण्डानाम् अन्तेवासिसम्पदस्तथा ग्रन्थसम्पदश्च अस्माकं महार्घ्यभूता इति शास्त्रपरिशीलनेन तेषां जीवितकालः सर्वथा सार्थकतामभजत इत्येव शोकसन्तप्तानां परिसान्त्वनम् ॥

तेषां च पूतचरितानां कर्मवीराणां जीवः परमशिवसायुज्यमासाद्य परमानन्दमनुभूयादिति नः प्रार्थना ॥

Setu Samsthana Mahavidvan Bhasha Kavisekhara R. Raghava Ayyangar :—

1. பண்டி தர்க்குயர் மேன்மைசெய் பான்மையன்
அண்டி னர்க்குநல் லாதர வானவன்
மிண்டி னர்க்குமி டலரி வேந்தனுன்
கொண்ட சீர்த்திமை கொள்குப்பு சாமியே.

2. ஆய்ந்த சில்வன் லேவியெனு மான்றவன்
போந்து கண்டுபொ ருவில்தெய் வச்சிலை
ஏந்த நல்கிய வேற்றமு ளான்மதி
கூர்ந்த வந்தணர் கோன்குப்பு சாமியே.

3. பெருப்பெ ரியவு வாத்திப் பெரும்பெயர்
திருப்பெ ருகிய வேந்தர்செய் சீரினன்
கருப்பெ ரியவன் கல்வியின் வீறினன்
குருப்பெ ரியவர் கோன்குப்பு சாமியே.

4. பாடஞ் சொல்லிநற் பண்டித ராக்கிய
சீட ராயிரர் சேர்ந்த குலபதிப்
பீடு சேர்பெயர் பெற்ற பெருமையன்
கூடு நல்லிசைக் கோன்குப்பு சாமியே.

5. ஆரி யர்தழைத் தற்கரும் பாடுபட்
டேரி யல்லவை கண்டெழில் ஞானத்தின்
சூரி யன்னென நின்றவன் தொன்மையிற்
கூரி யன்கலைக் கோன்குப்பு சாமியே.

6. வித்தை யிற்பிரு கற்பதி மேன்மையன்
இத்தை நல்வட நாட்டறி வெய்தினர்
ஒத்தி யம்பிய வொண்மையு ளான்கலைக்
கொத்தி னின்ற குலக்குப்பு சாமியே.

7. தூய மேலவர் தொக்கநன் னண்பினன்
ஆய சீர்வட சொற்கட லத்தனை
மேய நூற்பெய ரும்வெளி செய்தற்குக்
கூய வித்தகர் கோன்குப்பு சாமியே.

8. சென்னைப் பல்கலை மன்றினுஞ் சீர்த்தியின்
மன்னு மண்ணு மலைக்கழ கத்தினும்
நன்ன ரார்ந்தனன் ஞானத்தொண் டாற்றலிற்
கொன்னுஞ் சாயலன் கோன்குப்பு சாமியே.

வேறு

9. இபனுமிவன் பெருந்தலைமை யெய்தியினி தமர்ந்ததனல்
மயிலைவட மொழிச்சாலை மன்னியவை யாற்றிடையே
பயிலும்வட மொழிச்சாலை பல்லாற்றும் வளர்ந்தனவால்
முயலுமிவள் கலைப்பணியின் முயலாத நாளிலையே.

10. கையெழுத்து நூனிலயக் கண்காணி யிவனாகி
மெய்யழுத்த முறச்செய்த வேலைகளு மிகப்பலவால்
மொய்பழுத்த வகராதி முற்றுமவைக் கினித்மர்ந்து
பெய்யெழுத்து மாற்றத்திற் பிறந்தசொற்சீ ரியல்புரைத்தான்.

11. நாவலந்தீ விற்கலைக ளூட்டுபல கழகமெலாம்
ஆவலுட னிவன்றொடர்பை யடைந்துயரச் சிறந்தனவால்
காவல்வட கலைக்காகிக் கற்றவர்க ணற்றுணையாய்
பாவலவன் செய்தபணி பகர்ந்தளவி லடங்காவால்.

12. என்கண்ணின் மணியனையா னிருக்காதி வேதமெலாம்
தன்கண்ணிற் கரைகண்டோன் தார்க்கிகன்வே தாந்தியலால்
இன்கண்வை யாகரண னெழின்மீமாங் சகனிவனே
புன்கண்மை யில்லாத புகழ்க்குப்பு சாமியென்போன்.

13. இத்தகையோ னெமைநீத்தா னினிவாரா னெனக்கேட்டுப்
பொய்த்தவுல கியல்பெண்ணிப் புன்கண் கூர்ந்துருகுவமால்
ஒத்தகுப்பு சாமிசெய்த வுதவியிற்குக் கைம்மாறே
எத்தனையு மிலைபாலோ வெம்முளத்தன் பிடுவமரோ.

14. அன்பாலே யுருகுவதோன் றல்லாம லகமெல்லாம்
துன்பாலே சிதைகின்றேஞ் சொல்லாலே புலம்புதுமால்
இன்பாலே மொழிகின்ற வெழிற்குப்பு சாமிசென்ற
பின்பாலே தெந்ததகாண் பெரியோரின் பிரிவிடரே.

Dr. P. S. Subrahmanya Sastri, Principal, Rajah's College of Sanskrit and Tamil Studies, Tiruvadi (Retd.), and Head of the Sanskrit Dept., Annamali University, Annamalainagar (Retd.) :—

முதன் முதலில் 1913-இல் ப்ரின்ஸிபல் ஸ்ரீமான் குப்புஸ்வாமி சாஸ்திரிகள் அவர்களைத் திருவையாற்றில் நான் அறிவேன். அப்போது ஆங்குள்ள ஹைஸ்கூலில் கணிதம் கற்பித்துக் கொண்டிருந்தேன். அவர்கள் சென்னை ப்ரஸிடென்ஸி காலேஜிலிருந்து அங்குத் திரும்பி வந்தபோது அவர்கட்கு அந்த ஹைஸ்கூலில் ஸம்ஸ்க்ருத ஆசிரியராயிருந்த ம-ா-ா-ஸ்ரீ நீலகண்ட சாஸ்திரியார் அவர்கள் என்னை அவர்களிடம் கூட்டிப்போய், 'இவர் M.A. பரீட்சைக்கு வேண்டிய ஸம்ஸ்க்ருத நூல்களைப் படித்து வருகிறார்' எனக் கூறினர். உடனே தாமும் த்வன்யாலோகம் வ்யக்திவிவேகம் என்ற நூல்களை எனக்குக் கற்பிப்பதாக அன்புடன் ஏற்றுக்கொண்டனர்.

அதைக்கேட்டு ஸம்ஸ்க்ருத காலேஜிலே ஆங்கில வாசிரியர் காலஞ் சென்ற ஸ்ரீமான் S. வேதாந்தமய்யங்காரும் அவற்றைப் படிக்க விரும்பினர். எங்களிருவர்க்கும் மாலை ஸந்த்யாவந்தனஞ் செய்தபிறகு கற்பிக்சத் தொடங்குவார். 9, 9-30 மணிக்கு முடிப்பார். எங்கட்குத்தான் முதன் முதலில் அந்நூல்களை முறையாகக் கற்பித்தது எனத் தோன்றுகின்றது. பின்னர்த் த்வன்யாலோகத்தைப் பன்முறைப் பல மாணவர்க்குப் போதித்தனர் என்பது வெளிப்படை. சில ஆண்டுகட்கு முன்னர்ச்

சென்னையில் இரவிற் பேசிக்கொண்டிருக்கையில், 'அப்போது த்வன்யாலோகத்தை உனக்குக் கற்பித்தேன், இப்போது ஒருமுறை கற்பிக்க ஆசைப்படுகிறேன்' என்றனர். அவ்வாசையும் முக்காற்பங்கு நிறைவேறிற்று என்பதைப் பணிவுடன் அறிவிக்கின்றேன். அவர்கள் கணபதியக்ராகாரத்திற்கு வந்தபின்னர்த் தமிழில் த்வன்யாலோகத்தை மொழிபெயர்கலாமா எனத் தெரிவித்தேன். மிகுந்த ஆவலுடன், 'நல்லகாரியம், உடனே தொடங்கு' என்று அனுமதி கொடுத்தனர். மொழிபெயர்த்த பிறகு தொடக்கத்திலிருந்து குணீபூதவியங்கியம் தொடங்கும்வரை எழுத்தெழுத்தாக ஆய்ந்து பலவிடத்தில் திருத்தியுஞ் சீர்மைப்படுத்தியும் எனக்கு உதவிய அப்பெரியார்க்கு கைம்மாறு யாது செய்வேன்? 1913 முதல் 1943 வரையில் அவர்களிடம் மாணாக்கனாயிருந்த பெருமை எனக்குக் கிடைத்தது என மகிழ்கின்றேன்.

தமிழ் லெக்ஸிகன் ஆபீஸ், திருவையாறு அரசர் கல்லூரி, அண்ணாமலை யூனிவர்ஸிடி இவற்றில் நான் வேலைபார்த்ததற்கும் பார்ப்பதற்கும் அப்பெரியாரே காரணம். சென்னையில் நான் இருக்கும்போது வ்யுத்பத்திவாதத்திலும் ஒரு பகுதி எனக்குக் கற்பித்தனர். Journal of Oriental Research இல் என்னுடைய History of Grammatical theories, ஆங்கில வுரையுடன் கூடிய தொல்காப்பியம் இவற்றைப் பதிப்பித்தனர்.

இவ்வாறு பல்வகையில் எனக்கு உதவியவரும், பிறப்புமுதல் இறப்புவரை ஸம்ஸ்கிருததேவியையே உபாஸித்து அவளை விளங்கச் செய்தவரும், அறிவே பொருளெனக் கருதியவரும், அறிவுடையாரைப் போற்றியவரும், அஞ்சா நெஞ்சத்தினரும், உண்மையே தெய்வம் எனக் கருதியவரும், M.A. வகுப்பில் படிப்போர் சாஸ்திர நூல்களைப் படிக்குமாறு செய்தவரும், சிரோமணி, வித்வான் பரீட்சைகள் தோன்ற மூலகாரணம் ஆனவரும், பல நூல்களிற் சரியான பாடங்களை முயன்று கண்டுபிடித்து இனியமுறையில் மாணவர்கட்குப் போதித்தவரும், மாணவர் தமக்குப் புரியாத பலவிடங்களை எளிதாகப் புரியும்படி செய்தவரும், மாணவர்களும் நண்பர்களும் செய்தவேலை திருத்தமுற இருத்தல் வேண்டும் என அவர்களோடும் பலகாலம் செலவிட்டவரும், மாணவர் எழுதிய சிறப்பினைத் தஞ்சிறப்பாகவே மதித்தவரும், தம்மாணவர்களுள் இரண்டு மகாமகோபாத்தியாயர்களையும் ஆறு டாக்டர்களையும் (Ph.D., D. Litt.) உடையவரும் ஆகிய அப்பேராசிரியரை இப்போது இங்குக் காணோம். அப்பெரியார்க்கு யான் யாதுரை செய்யக்கூடும்? அப்பெரியாரின் ஆன்மா நல்லுலகிற் பெருமகிழ்வுடன் வாழவேண்டும் என்று கடவுளின் அடிகளில் வீழ்ந்து வேண்டுதல் ஒன்றே கூடும்.

Sri R. Visvanatha Iyer, Tamil Professor, Presidency College, Madras:—

மகாமகோபாத்தியாய சாஸ்திரியார் அவர்களை நான் முதன் முதலில் 1934-ஆம் வருஷம் ஜூன் மாதத்தில் ஒரு நாள் நடுப்பகலில் அவர்களுடைய கிராமத்தில் தரிசித்தேன்.

சென்னைச் சர்வகலாசாலைப் பரீக்ஷாவிதிகளுள் இலகுவில் விளக்கமாகாத ஒரு பகுதியை விளக்கிக் கொள்ளவும் ஒரு பரீக்ஷையின் முறையில் வித்தியார்த்திகளுக்கு இருக்கும் கஷ்டத்தைக் குறைக்க முடியுமாவென்று அவர்களைக் கேட்டு அவர்களுடைய உதவியை நாடவுமே நான் அவர்களிடம் சென்றிருந்தேன். சர்வகலாசாலையின் திட்டங்களில் அவருக்கிருந்த பரிபூரணமான அறிவும் வித்தியார்த்திகளிடம் அவருக்கிருந்த நிறைந்த அனுதாபமும் எனக்கு அப்பொழுது நன்ருய் விளங்கின. பரீக்ஷை முறையில் கஷ்டமான பகுதியென்று நான் கருதினதை அவர்கள் அங்கீகரிக்கவில்லை. பட்டம்பெற விரும்புகின்றவர்கள் ஆழ்ந்த அறிவைப் பெறவேண்டிய அவசியத்தை அவர்கள் வற்புறுத்திஞர்கள் அவர்கள் கல்வியின் மேன்மையைப் பற்றிய கவலைடைக் கொண்டதாக அவர்களுடைய கொள்கை இருந்ததேயன்றிப் பரீக்ஷைகளின் வலிவைத் தளர்த்திக்கொடுக்க அவர்கள் விரும்பவில்லை என்பதை நான் அறிந்தேன்

பிறகு, அதேவருஷம் ஆகஸ்டு மாதம் நான் சென்னைக்கு இராஜதானிக் கலாசாலைக்கே மாற்றப்பட்டு வந்தபின்பு அவர்களின் கீழே நேராகச் சேவைபுரியும் பாக்கியத்தைப் பெற்றேன். உத்தியோக முறையிலும் தனிமுறையிலும் அவர்களைப் பலமுறையும் சந்திக்க எனக்கு வாய்ப்பு கிடைத்தது.

சாதாரணமாக, சாஸ்திரிகள் அவர்களின் ஸம்ஸ்க்ருதப் புலமையையே உலகமறியும். அக்கல்விக்கு என்றும் அழியாத அவருடைய சேவையையே உலகம் புகழ்கின்றது. ஆனுல், சாஸ்திரிகளுக்கு எல்லாப் பாஷைகளிலும் நிறைந்த அபிமானம் உண்டென்பதை அவர்களுடன் நெருங்கிப் பழகியவர்களே அறிவார்கள். தாய்மொழிப் பண்டிதர்களிடம் அவருக்குத் தனிமையான மதிப்பு உண்டு. அவர்களின் ஆழ்ந்த பாஷா ஞானத்தை அவர் மிகவும் மெச்சுவார். துரைத்தனத்தார் அவர்களுடைய நிலையை உயர்த்தாமல் வைத்திருப்பதைக் குறித்து அவர் பலமுறை வருந்தியதுண்டு. தம் தனிமுறையில் தம் செல்வாக்கால் பண்டிதர்களுக்குச் செய்யக்கூடிய வற்றைத் தாமே வலிந்து வந்து செய்து உதவியதற்கும் சாட்சிகள் பல உண்டு.

எல்லாப் பாஷைகளிலும் சாஸ்திரியாருக்கு அன்பு உண்டு என்ருலும் தமிழிலே அவருக்குள்ள அபிமானம் தனியானது. காலஞ்சென்ற மகாமகோபாத்தியாய சாமிநாத அய்யர் அவர்களிடம் சாஸ்திரியார் தனிமையான மரியாதை வைத்திருந்தார்கள். காலஞ்சென்ற பண்டிதர் அனந்தராமையர் அவர்களுடன் அடிக்கடி சங்கநூல்களின் விஷயங்களைப் பற்றிச் சாஸ்திரியார் உசாவியதுண்டென்றும் அவ்வாராய்ச்சியால் பத்துப்பாட்டு, சிலப்பதிகாரம், மணிமேகலை போன்ற நூல்களில் நல்ல பரிச்சயம் பெற்றிருந்தார் என்றும், நான் அவர்களிடமிருந்தே கேட்டறிந்திருக்கிறேன். அறவண வடிகளின் காலத்தை ஆராய்ந்து கீழ்க்கண்ட ஆராய்ச்சிப் பத்திரிகையில் (Journal of Oriental Research) அவர்கள் எழுதியுள்ள கட்டுரை தமிழ்ச்சரித்திரத்திற்கே ஓர் ஆதாரமாய் உள்ளது. துரைத்தனத்தார் உயர்தரப் பாடசாலைகளுக்காகக் கலைச்சொற்களுக்குத் தகுந்த தாய்மொழிச் சொற்களை நிறுவின

போது சாஸ்திரியார் அவர்கள், தமிழுக்காக அமைக்கப்பட்ட எல்லாக் கமிட்டிகளிலும் அங்கத்தினராக இருந்து அரியசேவை புரிந்திருக்கிறார்கள். சென்னைச் சர்வகலாசாலையார் வெளியிட்ட தமிழ் அகராதிக்கு அவர்கள் புரிந்த சேவையும் குறிக்கத்தக்கது. 3-7-1917-ல் துரைத்தனத்தார் விடுத்த உத்தரவின்படி அமைக்கப்பெற்ற அகராதிக் கமிட்டியில் சாஸ்திரியார் ஓரிடம் பெற்றார். அன்றுமுதல் அவ்வகராதி முடிவடையும் வரையில் சாஸ்திரியார் தம் ஆழ்ந்த ஆராய்ச்சித்திறன், ஆளும் சக்தி, ஆகியவற்றை அவ்வகராதிக்காக முழுமையும் தாராளமாகக் கொடுத்திருக்கிறார் என்பது மிகையாகாது.

அன்றியும் தனித்தமிழ் வித்வான் பட்டப்பரீக்ஷைகள், B. O. L. பட்டப்பரீக்ஷைகள் போன்ற பரீக்ஷைகளுக்குத் திட்டங்களை வகுப்பதில் சாஸ்திரியாருடைய முயற்சி சாதாரணமானதன்று. சுருக்கச் சொல்வோமானால் சென்னைத் துரைத்தனத்தாரும், சென்னைச் சர்வகலாசாலையாரும் சென்ற இருபத்தைந்தாண்டுகளாகத் தமிழ்போன்ற நாட்டு மொழிகளுக்காகச் செய்துள்ள எந்தவித முயற்சிக்கும் சாஸ்திரியாருடைய சம்பந்தம் ஏதாவது ஒருவகையில் இருந்தே வந்தது என்பது யாவரும் அறிந்ததே.

சாஸ்திரியார் அவர்களுடைய ஆராய்ச்சித்திறனையும் போதனாசக்தியையும் அவர்கள் தம் மாணவர்களிடம் காட்டும் அன்பும், அவர்களுடைய மாணாக்கர்களால் நன்கு புகழப்படுகின்றன. ஆனால் அவர்களுடைய ஆட்சித்திறனையும், அண்டினவர்களுக்கு அவர்கள் காட்டும் ஆதரவையும் சிலரே அறிவர். சாஸ்திரியார் தமக்குக் கீழ்வேலை செய்பவர்களை மிகவும் நுட்பமாக ஆராய்ந்தே நியமித்துக் கொள்வர். அவர்களிடம் முழுநம்பிக்கையும் வைத்து அவர்களின் வழியில் தாம் அனாவசியமாகத் தலையிடாமல் முழுப்பொறுப்பையும் அவர்களிடம் விட்டு விடுதலே அவர்களுடைய ஆட்சிமுறை. தாம் தம் வேலையைச் சிறிதும் சோம்பலில்லாமலும், பொய்மையில்லாமலும், செய்துவருவதால் அப்பழக்கங்கள் அவர்களின் கீழ்வேலை செய்பவர்களிடமும் தாமாகவே படிகின்றன.

தோற்றத்தில் கடுமையுள்ளவரானாலும், அவர் ஒருவரையாவது மனம் நோகச் சொன்னவரல்ல. எவரிடமும் மரியாதையும், அன்பும், அவர் காட்டுவர். தம் கோபத்தை அன்புடன் உபதேசம் செய்வதைப் போலவே காட்டுவர். காரியாம்சத்தில் எவரையும் அவர் கெடுத்தவரல்லர். அவரால் நன்மைபெற்றவர்களைப் பலராக நாம் எண்ணலாமேயன்றி அவரால் கெடுக்கப் பட்டவரை ஒருவரென்றுகூட எண்ணுதல் முடியாது. அவர்களிடம் வேலைசெய்வதே ஒரு தனி கௌரவம்.

சாஸ்திரியார் அவர்கள் வாழ்க்கையைப்பற்றிப் பல உயர் நோக்கங்கள் கொண்டுள்ளவர்கள். ஜன்மாந்திரத்தில் அவர்களுக்கு நல்ல நம்பிக்கையுண்டு. ஒரு பிறப்பில் உழைத்த உழைப்பு மறுபிறப்பிலாவது பலன் கொடுக்கத் தவறாது என்று சொல்லி என்னை அவர் சில தடவைகள் ஊக்கியதுண்டு. தாழ்ந்த பொருள்களிடத்திலும் மக்களிடத்திலும் நமக்கு நல்ல படிப்பினையைத் தரத்தக்க அம்சங்கள் உண்டு என்று அவர் அடிக்கடி கூறுவார்.

நெடுநாளைக்கு முன்னே தமக்கு ரிக்ஷா இழுத்த ஒருவனுடைய உயர்குணங்களையும், சீரிய நோக்கங்களையும் பற்றி ஒருநாள் என்னிடம் கூறினார். தம்மையும் இகழத்தக்க இரண்டொருவர் உலகத்தில் இருக்கின்றனரே என்று ஒரு பெரியார் அவரிடம் கூறினபோது ரோஜாச் செடியிலும் முள்ளுண்டு என்று அவர் சொன்னதாக நான் கேட்டிருக்கிறேன். வேற்றுமையில் ஒற்றுமையைக் காணாமல், ஒற்றுமையில் வேற்றுமையைக் காணமுயலும் இக்காலப்போக்கைக் குறித்து அவர் பல தடவைகள் வருந்தி இருக்கிறார். ஸம்ஸ்க்ருதத்தில் அன்பு குறையாமல் இருந்த காலத்திலேதான் தமிழ் நூல்கள் நிரம்ப உண்டாயினதென்பது அவர் கருத்து.

சாஸ்திரியார் அவர்களின் வெற்றிக்குக் காரணம் அவருடைய தீர்க்காலோசனையும், அவர்கள் தாம் எடுத்த பகுதிகளை யெல்லாம் முன்பாகவே அலசிப்பார்த்து, அதற்கு வரும் இடையூறுகள் யாவற்றையும் முன்பாகவே எதிர்பார்த்து அவற்றினின்று தம்மைப் பாதுகாத்துக் கொள்ளவேண்டிய முன்னெச்சரிக்கைகள் யாவற்றையும் செய்து வைத்தக்கொள்ளவே. முன் தயாரிப்பில்லாமல் அவர்கள் எக்காரியத்திலும் இறங்கினதில்லை. அமைதியாய் இருக்க வேண்டியபோதெல்லாம் அமைந்திருந்து, தகுந்த சமயத்தில் தகுந்த முறையில் தம் முயற்சிகளைச் செய்து வந்ததாலேதான், அவர் எடுத்த காரியங்கலெல்லாம் மிகவெற்றிகரமாய் முடிந்தன. சர்வகலாசாலை வாதங்களில் அவர்களை அஞ்சாமனம் படைத்த ஒரு சிங்கமெனச் சிலர் கூறுவதில் சந்தேகமில்லை. அவர்கள் ஒரு சிறந்த வாதப்போர்வீரர். அப்போரில் அவர்கள் ஓரிடத்திலாவது புறப்புண் பட்டதில்லை.

காரியத்தில் அவர்கள் ஒருபுலியே ஆனாலும் அவர்களுடைய மனம் பசுவின் மனத்தை ஒத்தது. அவர்கள் வீட்டில் விருந்தினரை உபசரிக்கும் முறை மிக மேன்மையானது. அண்ணாமலைச் சர்வகலாசாலை அலுவல்களுக்குச் சென்னையிலிருந்து செல்பவர்களுக்குத் தாராளமாகச் செல்லத்தக்க இடம் அவர்களுடைய விடுதியே. சென்னையில் அவர்களிருந்த காலத்தில் அவர்களின் விருந்தினர்க்கு அளவே இல்லை.

இத்தகைய குணங்கள் நிறைந்த பெரியார் தம் பூதஉடலை நீத்தாரென்றாலும் அவர்களுடைய புகழுடல் இவ்வுலகத்திலிருந்து ஒருநாளும் நீங்காது. தமிழர் சான்றாண்மை என்று எதனைக் கூறுவரோ அப்பண்புக்குச் சான்றாயிருந்தவர் சாஸ்திரியார் அவர்களே. அத்தகையோர் அருகிவரும் இக்காலத்தில் சாஸ்திரியார் அவர்களின் வாழ்க்கை மலையிலிட்ட விளக்குப்போல் தம்மையும் உலகத்தையும் விளக்கிவந்தது. அவ்விளக்கின் தண்டு இனி கண்ணுக்குப் புலப்படாது, ஆனால் அந்த ஜோதி என்றும் விளங்கும்.

# SELECT OPINIONS

**Hermann Jacobi, Professor of Sanskrit, University of Bonn, 14th December, 1926.**—I have perused your new Journal of Oriental Research with great interest. I heartily wish you success in your meritorious undertaking.

**L. D. Barnett, School of Oriental Studies, London, 19th December, 1926.**—It seems to me to be a good beginning to the enterprise which I hope will be very successful. Some of the matter is very good indeed.

**J. Jolly, Wurzburg, Germany, 20th December, 1926.**—This evidently is a periodical of great promise, with every chance of success.

**Q. Strauss, Professor of Sanskrit, Kiel University, 1st January, 1927.**—Being very well pleased with the first number of your Journal of Oriental Research I ask you to enrol me as a subscriber.

**Sir Richard Temple, Editor, Indian Antiquary, London, 6th January, 1927.**—Your excellent Issue.

**F. O. Schrader, Kiel, 9th January, 1927.**—I have read with absorbing interest through the first number and find its contents quite satisfactory.......... A Journal of this kind has been undoubtedly a need in Madras since long.

**Dr. Wilhelm Printz, Librarian, D. M. G. Halle, 14th January, 1927.**—......This fascicle contains many very interesting and scholarly articles: a very pretty start!

**"Bombay Chronicle." 12th December, 1926.**—................ The Quality of scholarship displayed is of a high order.

**"Indian Review." November, 1927.**—We welcome this new Quarterly of Oriental Research.................The influence of Professor S. Kuppuswami Sastri, the Professor of Sanskrit and Comparative Philology in Presidency College, has been ceaselessly exercised in furthering the cause of such learning........

**"New India," 20th December, 1926.**—..............The design and the get-up of the Journal is very good, and we recommend the Journal to all lovers of research and scholarship.

**"Hindu," 9th Feburary, 1927.**—............The Journal will not merely maintain the high level reached in its first number but frequently transcend itself.

**"Madras Mail," 21st January, 1927.**—...............The contributions are from persons who have specialised in particular branches and show striking evidence of original work....

**Dr. Sylvain Levi, Paris.**—......It deals with so many sides of Indian Science, and in such an interesting way. What I like most in it, is its genuine and regular Indian flavour, its proper 'Rasa'. Many of your contributors, if not all of them, know how to combine Pandit-learning and Western standards.

**Dr. H. Luders, Berlin University.**—..........I was greatly impressed with the high standard of scholarship, the orginality of thought and the soundness of critical methods displayed in your contributions.....

## THE KUPPUSWAMI SASTRI RESEARCH INSTITUTE, MADRAS

### GOVERNING BODY

PRESIDENT:

Sri T. R. Venkatarama Sastri, C.I.E.

VICE-PRESIDENTS:

Dr. Sir C. P. Ramaswami Iyer, LL.D., K.C.I.E.
Dr. Sir S. Radhakrishnan.
Dr. Sir A. Lakshmanaswami Mudaliar, LL.D., D.SC.

TRUSTEES:

Rao Bahadur K. V. Krishnaswami Iyer, B.A., B.L.
Rao Bahadur A. A. Venkatarama Iyer.

TREASURER:

Sri M. Subbaraya Iyer, B.A., B.L.

MEMBERS:

Rao Bahadur Prof. D. S. Sarma.
Dewan Bahadur K. S. Ramaswami Sastri.
Prof. P. N. Srinivasachariar.
Sri N. Raghunathan.
Sri T. Chandrasekharan, M.A., L.T.

SECRETARIES:

Sri K. Balasubrahmanya Iyer, B.A., B.L.
Prof. A Shanmukha Mudaliar, M.A.
Dr. V. Raghavan, M.A., PH.D.

### RESEARCH COMMITTEE

CHAIRMAN:

Prof. M. Hiriyanna.

VICE-CHAIRMAN:

Prof. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri.

MEMBERS:

Rao Sahib S. Vaiyapuri Pillai.
Dr. P. S. Subrahmanya Sastri, M.A., PH.D.
Dr. C. Kunhan Raja, M.A., D.PHIL.
Dr. A. Sankaran, M.A., PH.D.
Prof. V. A. Ramaswami Sastri, M.A.

EX-OFFICIO:

Sri K. Balasubrahmanya Iyer, B.A., B.L.
Prof. A. Shanmukha Mudaliar, M.A.
Dr. V. Raghavan, M.A., PH.D. (*Correspondent for the Journal*).

**All Communications should be addressed to the Correspondent, Journal of Oriental Research, Kuppuswami Sastri Research Institute, Mylapore, Madras.**

---

PRINTED BY N. RAMARATNAM, M.A., B.L., AT THE MADRAS LAW JOURNAL PRESS
55 & 56 MUNDAKANNI AMMAN KOIL STREET, MYLAPORE, MADRAS.
PUBLISHED BY K. BALASUBRAHMANYA AYYAR, KSRI., MYLAPORE, MADRAS.